

Chapter 6.

Neighborhood Mobility in Central Cities, Suburbs, and Non-metro Areas\ In Race-Ethnic Perspective

Donald J. Bogue

I

Introduction: Race-Ethnic Distribution and Change In Central City and Suburban Areas 1990-2000

Previous chapters have studied mobility processes from the viewpoint of metropolitan and non-metropolitan entities as total aggregates. This chapter examines these processes separately within central cities and suburban areas, demonstrating that there are distinguishing differences between the two components of metro areas. Further, it subdivides central cities, suburbs and non-metro territory into *neighborhoods* (census tracts), and researches mobility at this very local level. The focus is primarily upon demographic composition and distribution, particularly race-ethnicity.

Race-ethnic trends in Central Cities and Suburbs, 1990-2000. Table 1 reports the aggregate population size and race-ethnic composition in central cities and suburbs of the 364 metropolitan areas in 1990 and again in 2000, and the intercensal change.

(insert Table 1)

- During the 1990-2000 decade the nation gained 32.8 million inhabitants, two-thirds of which went to suburban areas. The remainder was about equally split between central cities and non-metropolitan areas. Suburban areas grew at a rate 2.5 times that of central cities. Nonmetro areas grew faster than central cities, but slower than suburbs.
- About 40 percent of this population gain was *Hispanic population*, due to the combined impact of high fertility and an unprecedented high volume of immigration, primarily from Mexico. This Hispanic immigration flowed into central cities, suburbs and non-metro areas at very high rates (60 percent for the decade), but was somewhat more directed toward suburbs than central cities
- Due to low fertility and low immigration, the *white non-Hispanic population* grew at a very slow rate (3.2 percent). This population declined in central cities, but grew moderately in suburbs and non-metro areas. As of 2000, barely one-half of the population of central cities was white non-Hispanic, and in several it was a minority.
- Due to greatly lowered fertility and limited immigration *Afro-American population* grew moderately rapidly (16.7 percent), much more rapidly in suburbs than in central cities. (There was almost no Afro-American growth in non-metro areas).

- Although it began the decade with a small base, the *Asian population* grew at a very rapid rate due primarily to immigration. This growth was rapid in central cities, but even more rapid in suburbs. It grew much more slowly in non-metro areas.
- The *American Indian* population grew at a rate slightly faster than the nation (due to moderately high fertility with almost no immigration). This growth occurred both in central cities and suburbs, and much less in non-metro areas (where Indian reservations are located). Thus Indian metropolitan-ward movement showed no preference for suburbs.

The net result of these changes was a net decline in the share of population living in central cities and a *substantial gain for suburbs, for all race-ethnic groups* except American Indian. This is a continuation of a long-standing trend. (Schnore and Klaff 1968) Non-metro areas made small net gains in the share of white and Hispanic population, but suffered loss in share of American Indian, Afro-American, and Asian residents

Census tracts as neighborhoods. It is common knowledge that central cities, suburbs and non-metro areas alike are heterogeneous in both demographic and socio-economic characteristics. This diversity can be explored by subdividing each of these categories into local neighborhood areas. Census tracts are a well-established unit of area for such small area study. With average population of about 4,200 persons (1,400 households) census tracts are relatively homogeneous local areas jointly established by local experts and the Bureau of Census., and have been in use for this purpose since the 1920 census. The census tract boundaries for the census of 2000 (65,443 tracts) were applied to the census of 1990, to provide data for comparable areas for both dates, thereby enabling rather precise measurement of change during the decade within each neighborhood individually. Within this format a wide range of variables and cross-classifications of variables, were made available (Geolytics 2003). This makes it possible to study the broad suburbanization trends documented in Table 1 in terms of their constituent neighborhoods, and their race-ethnic and socio-economic composition, in central cities and suburbs.

Race-ethnic change in neighborhoods. The tendency for persons of the same race-ethnic ancestry to aggregate themselves (or be aggregated) (“segregated”) in close residential proximity is an almost worldwide phenomenon, in all stages of modernization, both in urban and rural areas. Metropolitan areas of the U.S. (both central cities and suburbs); where ethnic clustering and separation has almost everywhere long been strong and sometimes turbulent, certainly are no exception (Logan, Stults and Farley. 2004) (Lieberson, 1963). If this separation of residence by ancestry is not the result of voluntarily preference it is typically reinforced by socio-economic or even quasi-legal forces. Past studies of this phenomenon have compared compositional distributions, and their differences, with little consideration of the dynamics by which they change or do not change over time. This chapter studies race-ethnic clustering *in terms of spatial mobility* as it manifested itself place in the U.S. during 1990-2000 decade, using census tracts as representative of neighborhoods. For this study, each census tract has been classified into a race-ethnic type in terms of it’s *predominate race-ethnic group* (numerically largest) of residents. [For this analysis, tracts with extremely small populations (less than 100 residents either in 1990 or 2000) have been excluded. The 817

excluded tracts contained less than three-tenths of one percent of the population in 2000.] Table 2 cross-tabulates the census tracts by their predominate race-ethnic classification in 2000 by the same classification in 1990.

(insert Table 2)

- In 2000, 51,321 tracts (79 percent) were predominately non-Hispanic white; 7,028 (11 percent) were predominately Afro-American, and 5,576 (9 percent) were predominately Hispanic. These are roughly the proportions of these groups in the national total. Asians, smaller in number and more diffused among the white population, were predominate in only 801 tracts.
- During the 1990-2000 decade 60,483 tracts (94 percent) retained their same predominate ethnicity. Of the 4,143 tracts that changed, more than three-fourths were tracts that shifted from predominate white to one of the minority groups. In the process, 2,054 more tracts became Hispanic, 885 more became Afro-American and only 292 more became predominately Asian.
- Where one minority group displaced another, Hispanics and Asians tended to displace Afro-Americans more frequently than they were displaced by Afro-Americans. Although Afro-Americans gained only 21 tracts from Hispanics and Asians whites, they lost 279 tracts to them, primarily to Hispanic.
- In central cities, Asians tended to displace Hispanics slightly more than they were displaced by Hispanics. The reverse tended to be true in suburbs.
- The entire turnover processes described above took place most readily in central cities, moderately frequently in suburbs, and much more sluggishly in non-metro areas.

In general, Afro-Americans were far surpassed by all other minorities except American Indian in the race-ethnic neighborhood takeover process. This stands in sharp contrast to previous decades when rapid Afro-American population movement, fueled by high fertility and rural-urban migration, was seen as neighborhood “invasion” (Duncan and Duncan 1957). The resulting process of “invasion-succession” was claimed to have stimulated “white flight” to the suburbs or other predominately white neighborhoods. (Orfield 1975) (Clotfelt 2001).

- There were numerous instances (175 tracts) in which Afro-American-predominate neighborhoods were reclaimed by white populations. This change was associated with “redevelopment” or “gentrification” and occurred primarily in central cities and older suburbs. (Wyly and Hammel 2004). The transition of 270 neighborhoods from predominately minority to predominately white residency is a new development that is itself accompanied by ethnic clustering. (Previously such “reverse invasion” was regarded as a development that almost never occurred (Duncan and Duncan 1957). Traditional ecological race-ethnic theory postulated that once a critical “tipping point” from white to a minority group is reached, a neighborhood never regains from being predominately minority. The significance of this new phenomenon of “reverse tipping” back to predominate white is explored below.

II

Demographic Dynamics of Neighborhood Race-Ethnic Change

Neighborhoods (census tracts) that changed predominate race-ethnic majority between 1990 and 2000 experienced very different demographic dynamics in comparison

with those that remained in the same race-ethnic type. Tracts that changed predominate race-ethnicity during the 1990-2000 decade tended have a considerable mixture of other race-ethnic groups (upper panel of text table below). Many were tracts that were near the midpoint phase of “turnover” from white to minority. Others may represent a long anticipated residential integration.

Predominate race-ethnicity	Percent Race-ethnic composition			
	White NH	Black	Asia	Hispanic
"TURNOVER" TRACTS				
White	48.2	26.5	6.0	13.3
Black	32.0	54.9	2.9	8.6
Asia	25.9	7.1	43.8	18.6
Hispanic	27.8	12.5	5.9	50.7
UNCHANGED RACE-ETHNICITY				
White	82.4	6.0	2.8	6.3
Black	11.9	80.0	1.2	6.6
Asia	15.8	4.0	58.1	12.6
Hispanic	13.2	7.3	4.2	73.8

Tracts that retained the same predominate race-ethnicity throughout the 1990-2000 decade (lower panel of text table above) were overwhelmingly of the predominate race-ethnicity, with small proportions of other groups. White and Afro-American neighborhoods strongly displayed this propensity (more than 80 percent same race-ethnicity). Unchanged Hispanic neighborhoods are only slightly less mono-ethnic (72 percent). In most cases of minority preponderance, white populations tend to be the largest minority group. This could indicate an incipient propensity toward integration, or an incomplete process of white withdrawal. Hispanic and Afro-American populations show a slight propensity to share neighborhoods, as do Asian and Hispanic.

Table 3 provides information about average percentage point change in race-ethnic composition of census tracts between 1990 and 200, grouped by race-ethnicity of tracts. It subdivides the census tracts (as above) into two major classes, those that underwent a change in race-ethnic type and those that retained their same race-ethnic classification. Each class is further subdivided by its predominate race-ethnic group. Its four panels provide this detail separately for central cities, suburbs, and non-metro areas. It documents the high propensity for population change at the neighborhood level to *reinforce race-ethnic clustering*.

(insert Table 3)

- Each race-ethnic groups grew rapidly *only* in those tracts where it newly became the predominate race, but tended to have little or negative growth in tracts where other race-ethnic groups were expanding. This reveals a continuation of traditional patterns of race-ethnic clustering in changing settlement.
 - White populations continued to retreat from tracts where they were not the predominate group. White non-Hispanic population declined most sharply (29 percentage points) in neighborhoods that changed white to predominate Afro-American, and only a little less drastically (22 percentage points) in neighborhoods that changed to predominate

Hispanic. White departure was least when the incoming predominate minority was Asian.

- Hispanics and Asians showed a mild propensity to occupy new neighborhoods jointly, but to avoid emerging Afro-American neighborhoods.
- White, Afro-American or Asian neighborhoods that retained their same race-ethnic type tended to have negative or very slow growth of all types of population. Apparently fully settled, they gained few additional residents either of same or other ancestry group. Existing dwellings simply changed occupancy, without creation of additional households. In sharp contrast, established Hispanic neighborhoods continued to add population, mostly additional Hispanics.
- The Afro-American population declined in all neighborhoods that changed to any other predominate type.

These data document that demographic change at the neighborhood level in the 1990-2000 decade was overwhelmingly one of continued race-ethnic clustering, with only limited race-ethnic integration. Meanwhile, rapidly growing Hispanic neighborhoods expanded into about 4 percent of tracts previously occupied by white, and moderately expanding Afro-American populations became predominate in almost 2 percent of such tracts.

III

The Role of Mobility in Neighborhood Race-Ethnic Composition Change

Population change can occur both by “vital processes” (birth and death) or by mobility (change of residence). However, as children mature and leave home, even they must change residence, even if locally. Thus, increase in numbers eventually manifests itself as residential mobility. Hence, for practically all of the changes described above, some form of residential mobility was the major vehicle of race-ethnic change. Illustrative information about the role of mobility in maintaining or changing neighborhood race-ethnic composition is provided by Table 4. This table is based on a tabulation of mobility status (place of residence in 1995 compared with place of residence in 2000) by race-ethnicity of the residents of each individual census tract. The data are found in Table PCT-64 of Summary Tape STF-3, U.S. Census of 2000. Table 4 reports the average race-ethnic composition (proportion of each race-ethnic group) for each type of mobile persons for individual census tracts. These data are for mobile persons classified by status at destination as local mobility (same county), internal migrant (different county in U.S.) or immigrant (abroad). Four left-hand columns report this information for the tracts that changed from one predominate race-ethnicity to another (turnover), while four right-hand panels report for tracts that did not change predominate race-ethnic type. Separate panels provide this information for central cities, suburbs, and non-metro areas. [Cells that report same-ethnicity between mobile persons and their neighborhood of residence in 2000 are in bold type.] In addition, the first line of each panel reports the average net migration rate (all ages) derived from an age-survival estimation between censuses. (The available data do not provide race-ethnic information about out-migration from census tracts.). *For all race-ethnic groups and for all types of mobility, residential change is overwhelmingly the flow of persons to a tract where their own race-ethnic group is predominate.*

(insert Table 4)

- *Local mobility.* In tracts that kept their same predominate race-ethnic composition, more than 70 percent of locally mobile persons who settled in a tract were of the same predominate race-ethnic group in that tract. Asians were exceptional in that this percent was only 56 percent. In tracts that changed predominate race-ethnic type 46-65 percent of locally mobile persons were of the same predominate race-ethnic group as the tract to which they moved.
- *Internal migration.* In tracts that kept their same predominate race-ethnic composition, 60-74 percent of internal migrants who settled in a tract were of the same predominate race-ethnic group in that tract. Asians were again exceptional in that this percent was only 43 percent. In tracts that changed predominate race-ethnic type 39-65 percent of internal migrants were of the same predominate race-ethnic group as the neighborhood of destination.
- *Immigration.* In tracts that kept their same predominate race-ethnic composition, 45-85 percent of internal immigrants from abroad who settled in a tract were of the same predominate race-ethnic group in that tract. In tracts that changed predominate race-ethnic type 35-64 percent were of the same predominate race-ethnic group.
- *Race-ethnic group.* Hispanics and Afro-Americans showed stronger overall propensities to same-ethnic type mobility than Asians. Whites were also strongly oriented to same-race mobility for internal migration, but less strong for local mobility or immigration.
- *Type of area.* The propensity for same-ethnicity clustering was about equally strong in central cities and suburbs and non-metro areas. Thus, there is little evidence that race-ethnic integration is more normal in suburbs than in central cities.
- *Net migration (all ages).* In general, neighborhoods where Afro-Americans were the predominate group tended to have negative net overall migration, whether newly formed or unchanged. Neighborhoods that were unchanged in Afro-American predominance suffered unusually large net migration loss. Hence, Afro-American neighborhoods tended to lose population, from departure of their own members from neighborhoods of high concentration. This was especially characteristic of central city neighborhoods, but was also typical of suburbs and non-metro areas. In contrast, net migration tended to be moderately positive in all other neighborhoods that changed in race-ethnic classification, but tended to be closer to zero for neighborhoods that retained the same predominate race-ethnic type. This implies that the substantial inflow of mobile persons of same-ethnicity into neighborhoods was matched by a nearly equal outflow of persons of the same as well as different race-ethnicity as those arriving.
- *Evidence of diffusion and desegregation.* Despite the very strong propensities noted in Table 4 a substantial, though minority, proportion of mobility is to different race –ethnic neighborhoods, particularly those undergoing race-ethnic change. White populations show a willingness to move into neighborhoods dominated by other minorities. All minorities show a propensity to migrate into neighborhoods dominated by whites. Whether this is competition for eventual

dominance or newly emerging tendencies for integrated living cannot be determined

That *the same-race mobility propensities reported above tend to pertain to each tract individually* is documented in Table 5. The five left-hand columns of this table report the bi-variate correlation between the percent race-ethnic composition of non-mobile and arriving mobile persons and the percent race-ethnic composition of the tract in 1990. The five right-hand columns report this correlation for percentage-point change in race-ethnic composition of the tract between 1990 and 2000. The right hand columns test the correlation between arriving mobile persons and the amount of *change* their race-ethnic composition had on the changing race-ethnic composition of the tract. .

(insert Table 5)

Local mobility. Movement from one residence to another within the same county is almost completely a movement from one same-ethnic neighborhood to another. For white, Afro-American, American Indian and Hispanic persons the correlation is above 0.90, and for Asians it is 0.85. Correlations for different-ethnic combinations are all negative, except for low positive associations between Hispanics and Asians.

Internal migration. Movement from one county to another is only slightly less overwhelmingly same-ethnicity as local mobility. All correlations are 0.85 or higher, except for Asian, which is 0.69.

Immigration. Immigrant from abroad is considerably less prone to settle in same-ethnic neighborhoods as internal migrants. Nevertheless, the correlations are quite high (0.50) or above, except for Asian (0.39).

Percentage-point change in race-ethnic composition. Due to the intense race-ethnic clustering described above, the vast majority of tracts show almost zero change in the percent of their population of each race-ethnic group (percentage-point change). The exceptions were the minority of tracts that experienced turnover from one group to another. The five right-hand columns of Table 5 document that mobility was the major vehicle of such change. The race-ethnic composition of the mobile persons arriving at individual tracts was highly correlated with the change in race-ethnic composition that the tract actually experienced in the 1990-2000 decade. The race-ethnic composition of local mobility, internal migration and immigration from abroad is strongly and positively correlated with overall net change in same-race composition. For example, the percent Hispanic of all arriving internal migration had a correlation of 0.573 with the percentage-point change in Hispanic composition of the tract. Corresponding values for Asian was 0.501, for white 0.428 and Afro-American 0.273. Correlations for combinations of different-race in-flow were almost uniformly negative and near-zero.

Race-ethnic change in particular metro areas. Appendix Table A-1 reports the 1990-2000 neighborhood turnover statistics for each metro area as of 2000. The largest and most varied type of turnover occurred in the central cities of the largest metro areas. Following is a listing of the information for the twenty most change-prone metro areas.

Name of metro area	Changed to:			
	White	Black	Asian	Hispanic
Los Angeles--Long Beach, CA	5	4	89	343
New York, NY PMSA	16	56	46	157
Riverside--San Bernardino, C	0	1	4	210
Chicago, IL PMSA	10	47	3	138

Houston, TX PMSA	5	35	5	152
Orange County, CA PMSA	1	0	36	83
Dallas, TX PMSA	1	27	0	86
Atlanta, GA MSA	2	81	0	25
Oakland, CA PMSA	4	0	39	60
Phoenix--Mesa, AZ MSA	1	0	0	97
Miami, FL PMSA	2	25	0	64
Washington, DC--MD--VA PMSA	4	62	0	25
San Diego, CA MSA	3	3	14	70
San Jose, CA PMSA	1	0	53	24
Fresno, CA MSA	1	0	0	52
Philadelphia, PA--NJ PMSA	1	42	1	9
Orlando, FL MSA	0	22	0	28
San Antonio, TX MSA	0	1	0	48
Detroit, MI PMSA	0	38	0	10
Las Vegas, NV--AZ MSA	1	2	0	44

In all but a few MSAs, Hispanic predominance is the dominant type of neighborhood change. Atlanta, New York, Washington DC, and Chicago stand out for their large expansion of Afro-American neighborhoods. New York, Orange County, Oakland and San Jose were major destinations for inflow of Asians.

White take-over from Afro-American and other minorities occurred primarily in the following metro areas: In all of these metros, minorities were simultaneously actively taking over predominately white neighborhoods.

Name of metro area	Changed to:			
	White	Black	Asian	Hispanic
New York, NY PMSA	16	56	46	157
Chicago, IL PMSA	10	47	3	138
San Francisco, CA PMSA	7	0	25	14
Los Angeles--Long Beach, CA	5	4	89	343
Houston, TX PMSA	5	35	5	152
Oakland, CA PMSA	4	0	39	60
Washington, DC--MD--VA PMSA	4	62	0	25
New Orleans, LA MSA	4	22	0	0
Honolulu, HI MSA	4	0	7	0
Charleston--North Charleston	4	6	0	0

IV

The Impact of Race-Ethnic Mobility on Neighborhood Economic Level

Neighborhoods that undergo change in race-ethnic composition simultaneously experience economic change due to differences in the economic status of arriving and departing residents. This is documented in Table 6, which reports the average median income for categories of tracts classified by predominate race-ethnic predominance, and whether this predominance was new or old. As is well known, neighborhoods with predominate white or Asian population tend to have above-average economic status,

while those with predominate Afro-American or Hispanic tend to have below average status.

(insert Table 6)

Median household income (first two columns). The median household income (thousands of dollars) for tracts that retained the same ethnicity between 1990 and 2000 were (bottom five panels) as follows:

Same race-ethnic predominate	Median 2000 (\$000)	Change in median, 1990-2000
White, non Hispanic	48.8	1.3
Asian	52.8	-0.9
Afro-American	28.7	-1.1
Hispanic	30.9	-0.4
Total	45.7	0.8

Different race-ethnic predominate	Median 2000	Change in median, 1990-2000
White, non Hispanic	36.9	6.3
Asian	55.1	-0.8
Afro-American	36.4	-2.8
Hispanic	36.5	-1.9

Predominately white tracts that kept the same race-ethnic classification enjoyed a slight *gain* in income, while all same-minority-race ethnic tracts suffered a small *loss*. Tracts that underwent change in predominate race-ethnic composition made considerably greater changes (positive for white, negative for minority groups). Tracts newly reclassified as white had considerably *lower* median household income than long-term white tracts in 2000 (because reclaimed tracts previously were either Afro-American or Hispanic, many still resident in 2000), but arrival of white population resulted in substantial *increase* in median household income. To the contrary, new Afro-Americans and Hispanic tracts were *higher* in status than same-ethnic counterpart, but the neighborhoods they entered appear to have suffered an even greater *decline* in median household income. Central cities and suburbs both exhibited this same combination of differences, with the effects of newly white predominance being much more positive in suburbs than in central cities, but of newly minority predominance being more negative in suburbs than in central cities. In non-metro areas, where median household income was lowest, the overall gain in income was positive for all race-ethnic groups except Asia. However, in non-metro areas the gains were also greater for white-predominate neighborhoods than for predominately Afro-American or Hispanic. In sum, *arrival in a neighborhood of white non-Hispanic mobile persons in a previously minority neighborhood tended to raise that neighborhood's income level; arrival of Afro-American or Hispanic mobile persons in a previously white neighborhoods tended to lower its income level.* Although statistically significant, the absolute magnitude of these income differences was quite small.

Poverty level. (columns 3 and 4, Table 6). The same pattern of differences for median household income described above is found for prevalence of poverty in neighborhoods. Being far more prevalent in Afro-American and Hispanic than in white

neighborhoods, the turnover to white of previously minority-predominate neighborhoods results in a substantial *decrease* in the prevalence of poverty (-4.7 percentage points). The turnover of previously white neighborhoods to Afro-American or Hispanic is accompanied by substantial *increases* in the prevalence of poverty (2.3 percentage points for Afro-American and 2.7 for Hispanic.)

Results similar to that for poverty are shown for rate of unemployment (two right columns of Table 6),

Discussion. Nothing in these results imply that in-mobility of minority groups somehow “causes” a decline in economic well-being of long-term residents, causing them to receive less income, to fall into poverty, or to become unemployed. When the arriving mobile persons possess these traits in greater proportions than the residents (and presumably of departing long-term residents), the result is a shift toward lower average state of economic well-being. Such in-mobility simply “dilutes” the pre-existing economic composition. Change in income level appears only to be simply a demographic bookkeeping: balance of the economic levels of arrivers and stayers at successive points in time. The interaction of the impact of mobility, race-ethnicity, and income level on neighborhood economic status is explored in more detail in the next chapter.

V.

The Impact of Race-Ethnic Mobility on Neighborhood Housing Worth

As neighborhoods change in their race-ethnic composition, the economic worth of the housing changes, reflecting the changing purchasing-power of their occupants. Table 7 presents data for three aspects of housing: Age of house (year built), media contract rent of rented housing, and sale value of owner-occupied housing. Data for each are shown for 1990, for 2000 and for change during the decade.

(insert Table 7)

Housing value (\$000). The average value of an owner-occupied house in 2000 was \$134,000. The value in 1990 (adjusted for inflation) was almost identical--only 2 thousand dollars less (three right hand columns). Tracts occupied by Asian and white population tend to have higher value, while tracts occupied predominately by Afro-American and Hispanic have considerably lower value. Housing in suburbs tends to have moderately higher value than in central cities---both almost double corresponding value in non-metro areas

- In keeping with the national trend, neighborhoods that retained the same predominate race-ethnic classification in 1990 and 2000 tended to show very little change in housing value, except for Asian (which had unusually expensive housing both in 1990 and 2000).
- However, tracts that changed from minority to white predominance *increased* substantially in value (+\$38,000), while tracts that changed to predominate Hispanic occupancy had substantial *declined* in housing value (-\$37,000). There was a similar, but less severe decline in housing value of tracts newly predominated by Afro-Americans (-\$7,000).
- The positive impact of white predominance on changing housing values is much stronger in central cities than in suburbs. In contrast, the negative impact of Hispanic and Afro-American predominance on housing values is considerably greater in suburbs than in central cities.

Housing rental. The average monthly rent paid by renters in 2000 was \$644, slightly less than average rent in 1990 adjusted for inflation (\$656).

- Rents were lowest in long-term Afro-American neighborhoods (\$518) and substantially below average in stably Hispanic neighborhoods (\$582). In long-term predominately white neighborhoods rents are slightly above average (\$661).
- However, in newly predominate white neighborhoods rents are substantially *lower* than in long-term white neighborhoods, while for Afro-American and Hispanics, this comparison is for higher rent. Thus, mobility into neighborhoods of white population tends to be associated with increase rents, while mobility into a neighborhood of Afro-American and Hispanic populations tends to be associated with decrease in rents.

Age of house. In 2000 the average age of housing was 32 years, an increase of 6 years over 1990—due to aging of the already-built housing stock. Housing in long-term Hispanic and Afro-American neighborhoods tends to be older than in white neighborhoods.

- Neighborhoods that changed from minority to white tended to have unusually older housing in comparison with long-term white neighborhoods. This is consistent with the phenomenon of “white gentrification” of long-settled areas formerly inhabited by minorities.
- The reverse tended to be true for Afro-American and Hispanics: those newly settled tended to have slightly younger housing than those of long-term minority predominance.
- For all groups, housing turnover in suburbs tended to occur at younger age of house than in central cities.

Multivariate impact of changing race-ethnic composition on housing worth.

Values in Table 7 are average values for categories of census tracts, and thus mask neighborhood-to-neighborhood deviations from its category average. More precise evaluation is provided by the multivariate analysis of Table 8. For this table, the change in average worth of housing for individual tracts (value in 2000 minus value in 1990) (rent in 2000 minus rent in 1990) is regressed on variables that measure the race-ethnic composition in 1990 and the change in race-ethnic composition between 1990 and 2000. (White non-Hispanic population is the omitted reference group.) This regression measures the consistency among tracts in these relationships, and how important they are for explaining change in housing worth.

(insert Table 8)

Change in value of housing. The findings of Table 7 are upheld by the regression analysis. Increase in the proportions of Afro-American and Hispanic residents in a neighborhood tends to be accompanied by a *decline* in the average value of housing. The relative impact appears to be greater for increased Hispanic than for Afro-American increase. Increase in the proportion of Asian residents tends to be accompanied by an *increase* in housing values. These comparisons control for the value of the neighborhood’s housing in 1990, and its race-ethnic composition in 1990. The relative impact of these changes appears to be neither drastically large nor inconsequentially small. For example, an increase of 10 percentage points in Hispanic composition during a decade predicts a decline over the decade of \$10,235 in the value of housing in the “invaded” neighborhood. This implies a decline of about 1 percent per year in value of

housing in 1990. For Afro-American entrants, the implied decrease is moderately less.

The regression model explains only about 14 percent of the increase or decrease of housing values, of which change in race-ethnic composition (due to mobility) accounts for less than one-half of the explained variance. Other housing qualities—style, location, amenities, quality of schools and other local facilities, economic base-- combine to be much more powerful than race-ethnicity of the neighborhood in explaining changes in housing values at the neighborhood level.

Change in contract rent of housing. Increase in the proportion of Afro-American and Hispanic residents in a neighborhood tends to be accompanied by a small decline in the average contract rent. This implies that such race-ethnic turnover is accompanied by a reduction in the rental value of property, independently of other factors. The decline appears to be slightly greater for increased Hispanic than for Afro-American. Increased occupancy by Asians appears to have the opposite effect: rental values increase. As for value of housing (above) these comparisons control for neighborhood rental level in 1990 and for race-ethnic composition in 1990. However, the average amount of rent decline is very small. An increase of 10 percentage points in the Hispanic composition of a neighborhood predicts only; about 3 percent decline in rent for the decade. A corresponding increase in Afro-American composition would induce slightly less than 2 percent decline in rental values. Because lower income households compete in a scarce low-cost rental housing market, rather than ownership market, rental values do not differ much by race-ethnic composition, or change in that composition.

Discussion. It would be difficult to prove that displacement of white by increased in-movement of minority race-ethnic population directly tends to depress housing values or rents, or that in-movement of whites and Asians tends increases them. It is equally plausible to argue that Afro-Americans and Hispanics, being of lower income, tend to rush into those niches of the housing market where values are lowest. Having higher average income, more prosperous mobile persons tend to move into neighborhoods with more amenities—that command higher purchase value or contract rent. *Nevertheless, Afro-Americans and Hispanics tend not to share the low-cost housing supply indiscriminately. Each tends to aggregate into neighborhoods where the other is scarce, thereby perpetuating race-ethnic concentration, and adding new ethnic neighborhoods in response to population growth.* The next chapter finds that this is also true for neighborhoods where the average level of wealth is higher.

VI

Conclusion

Within a decade, almost one household in five changes its residence. These residential changes involve all race-ethnic groups. *If this normal mobility were a process of random intermixture of race-ethnic groups, race-ethnic segregation would almost disappear within a decade of two.* This is not the case. Instead, mobility flows at the present time have the opposite effect of *perpetuating race-ethnic clustering* (segregation).

- Neighborhoods that experience no race-ethnic change (more than 90 percent of all neighborhoods) tend to be comprised of a single predominate race-ethnic group that comprises 80 percent or more of the population. Such neighborhoods receive in-movement almost exclusively of other persons of the same race-ethnicity.

- In the U. S. context of high residential mobility, each race-ethnic group is often observed to enter neighborhoods predominately inhabited by other race-ethnic groups. Yet this does not usually result in race-ethnic integration. Instead, as one race-ethnic population enters, others tend to retreat, which results in a process of “turnover” involving the departure of the one race-ethnic group and its replacement by another race-ethnic group. Within a decade or two the entering race-ethnic group becomes the almost exclusive occupant.
- The only exception to this phenomenon is a propensity for White and Asian populations to share neighborhoods.

The dramatic new phenomenon of rapid Hispanic immigration and growth from high fertility appears to have changed this picture only slightly. White and Hispanic populations are only slightly more prone to share the same neighborhood on a long-term basis than white and Afro-American. Hispanics and Asians have only modest propensity to intermingle with Afro-Americans, or each other.

Thus far, laws and programs intended to discourage such race-ethnic neighborhood homogeneity and segregation and to encourage and subsidize diversity and integration appear to have only minor effect on mobility flows, which continue to flow overwhelmingly either in a same-ethnicity pattern or to colonize new enclaves.

Nevertheless, there is minor evidence that this traditional clustering may be weakening under the impact of recent mobility trends. Small, but significant proportions of in-migrants and immigrants are not flowing to same-ancestry neighborhoods, but move into different-ancestry neighborhoods. This is evidence that the housing market is not completely “segmented” along race-ethnic lines. In a few large metro areas, white populations are moving into neighborhoods that were formerly inhabited by Afro-American residents. (Such neighborhoods are attractive because of favorable location or historic amenities which make them attractive investments of renovation.) Such places may retain their 2000 multi-ethnic characteristics indefinitely long, and not quickly revert to the traditional one-group tradition. Moreover, increasing numbers and proportions of minority populations are rising to an educational and economic level that enables them to openly compete for better quality housing in more affluent neighborhoods. This may explain the small multi-ethnic interflows noted in this study. Because these trends are expected to continue, they may mark the weakening of same-ethnic flows which has been so overwhelmingly the principal trait of residential mobility in America.

References

Clotfelder, Charles T. 2001. “Are Whites Still Fleeing? Racial Patterns and Enrollment Shifts in Urban Public Schools, 1987-1996.” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*. 20:199-221.

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

Geolytics 2003. Census CD 1990 Data Normalized to 2000 Boundaries. 2000 Long Form (SF-3) Data. *Geolytics Demographic Resources*. Geolytics, Inc.

Iceland, J. 2004. “Beyond Bland and White Metropolitan Residential Segregation in Multi-ethnic America. *Social Science Research*, 33: 248-271.

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

Logan, John R. Brian J. Stults, and Reynolds Farley. 2004. "Segregation of Minorities in the Metropolis: Two Decades of Change." *Demography*,41: 1-22.

Orfield, Gary ed. 1975. *Symposium on School Desegregation and White Flight*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.

Schnore, Leo F. and Vivian Zelig Klaff. 1968. "Suburbanization in the Sixties: A Preliminary Analysis." *Land Economics*. 48: 25-34.

Wyly, Elvin K. and Daniel J. Hammel. 2004. "Gentrification, Segregation, and Discrimination in the American Urban System." *Environment and Planning A*. 36:1215-41.