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ABSTRACT

Census tract data from the 1960 Census was used to analyze residential segregation in New Orleans. Three modes of residential segregation were analyzed: (1) segregation by race, (2) segregation by ethnicity, and (3) segregation by socioeconomic status. Correlational analysis was employed to test the following six hypotheses: (1) the predominately Negro areas of the city are those categorized by high unemployment rates and low socioeconomic statuses; (2) the predominately white areas of the city are those categorized by high socioeconomic statuses and low unemployment rates; (3) residential segregation is quantitatively higher in the areas which are the most homogeneous with respect to income, occupation, and education; (4) the foreign stock, mainly Italian stock, are as residentially segregated from Negroes as are the native whites; (5) the foreign stock reside in residential areas categorized by socioeconomic statuses not much different from the native white population; and (6) residential segregation is quantitatively higher in areas which have the most stable populations.

Hypotheses one, two, four, and five were supported by the data. Hypotheses three and six were only given partial support.

The Negro areas, contrary to hypothesis three, were not homogeneous with respect to socioeconomic status. On
the contrary, there was much less socioeconomic status segregation in these areas than in white areas. The homogeneity of white areas and the heterogeneity of "mixed" areas was anticipated by hypothesis three.

Hypothesis six was given partial support when population stability was interpreted as little or no intra-city migration. In general, white areas were characterized by in-migration and out-migration. Negro and "mixed" areas were characterized by intra-city migration. In general, migration was selective. The migrants and the areas into which they migrated were similar in terms of racial composition and socioeconomic status. The maintenance of residential patterns was the end result.

It was suggested that intra-city migration might be related to norms governing residential mixing.

A brief historical reconstruction of the Irish, German, and Italian immigration to New Orleans was presented. The areas of the city where the three immigrant groups first settled were plotted.

The main methodological contributions of this research were: (1) the demonstration that the multiple-partial correlation coefficient is a useful statistic for sociological research; and (2) the introduction of the coefficient of variability as a measure of socioeconomic status segregation.
In terms of the theoretical foundation, the main working assumption was that space has a social dimension, as well as, a geographical one. Sentiments are attached to geographical space. Social evaluations of an area and its inhabitants were thought to be operative in a person's choice of a residence. Consequently, importance was placed on the assumption that residential distance reflects social distance. This assumption was believed to be both tenable and basic to the justification of the study.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

New Orleans (Orleans Parish) contains six hundred and twenty-seven thousand inhabitants; of these two hundred and thirty-three thousand are Negro. As in other American cities, the Negroes in New Orleans are spatially separated from the "white" inhabitants. Thus, there are residential areas inhabited predominately by Negroes and other areas composed mostly of whites and still other mixed areas with various proportions of whites and Negroes.

Furthermore, studies of immigrant groups have demonstrated that they too are residentially isolated from the native population.¹ To what extent this generalization is applicable to the city of New Orleans, still remains to be answered empirically.

I. THE STATEMENT AND JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study (1) to analyze residential segregation by race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status; (2) to show the relationship between racial residential segregation and

socioeconomic status segregation; (3) to show how racial residential segregation is related to such variables as in-migration, out-migration, intra-city migration, median years of schooling, occupational prestige, family income, unemployment rate, age, sex, and population size; (4) to reconstruct the historical residential distribution of the Irish, German, and Italian immigrant; and (5) to show the relationship between ethnic segregation and such factors as per cent Negro and socioeconomic status.

It should be kept in mind that the term "status" has two distinct meanings. On the one hand, the term refers to the location in the social structure a person occupies, and on the other, it refers to the prestige attached to that location. It is these two different aspects of the term "status" that must be kept in mind in order to avoid confusion. In this study, both aspects of the term "status" are implied, although an attempt will be made to specify which aspect is being emphasized.

Justification of the problem. The residential area inhabited by an individual by and large reflects his style of life and his socioeconomic status position. Clearly an individual reflects his status (whether high or low), by his

---

choice of residence and its location. Thus residential segregation and status are interrelated. The theoretical significance of this research project may be in ascertaining some of the ways the two are related. It is hoped that in this way, some relevant contribution to stratification theory can be made.

Secondly, this project is a testing ground for a seldom used statistical model. The multiple-partial correlation coefficient has been almost totally ignored by sociologists. This project deals with variables which are ideally suited for this model. If proven to be successful, the model can be used to simplify research designs and handle very large amounts of data in an efficient manner.

Thirdly, certain measuring devices are suggested which are believed to be more efficient and less time consuming; and thus helpful to urban sociologists.

Fourthly, since this project incorporates many variables, the problem of interaction between variables becomes a necessary consideration. An application of the Goodman tests of interaction is included in the appendix.

---


applying these tests to the research variables here, it is hoped that their importance to research and their simplicity are demonstrated.

Fifthly, this research should shed some light on a current controversy among ecologists. In a recent paper, Beverly Duncan criticized Goldstein and Mayer along with other ecologists for their claim that certain ecological variables are becoming dissociated. Goldstein and Mayer have claimed that the old correlation between per cent foreign born and income has declined drastically. They see a general diminution of class differences as explaining the declining association of certain ecological correlations. This writer feels that this research study can shed some light on this current controversy by analyzing the relationship between the segregation score of the foreign stock and socioeconomic status.

II. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

The theoretical foundation on which this research study rests is a very simple but important notion. As a


social animal, man endows the concept of geographical space with cultural meanings. That is to say, geographical space has a social dimension. Only rarely are the two divorced.

This fact is reflected in many important ways. The head position at a dining table or a banquet is reserved for the head of the family or the most important guest at some social function. In school, the teacher's desk is almost always elevated and separated from those of the pupils. In the old South, Negroes sat in the back of buses and streetcars. This location symbolized their inferior position in southern society. Frequently references are made concerning "the other side of the tracks," "5th Avenue," "shanty town," "Millionaire Row," or "Skid Row." What is implied is not only a geographical location but a social one.

The assertion here is that geographical space is wedded to symbolic meanings. Whether the geographical space be a street or an area in a city, a region in a country, or a position at the dining table, makes no difference. The important thing is that these place names convey a social message. Geographical space becomes a "cue" to patterned human behavior just as clothing or names of address. The Mrs. or the Miss in front of a female's name cues us to behave in a certain way toward her. In the same way, knowing that a person is from the city, the country, "Skid Row," or "Millionaire Row" cues an observer to certain behavioral
One of the first sociologists to deal specifically with the importance of "place" in sociology was Frederic Le Play. In his now famous formula of Place, Work, and People, Le Play emphasized the importance of place or geographical location to sociological theory. For Le Play, "place" is important because it determines the method of procuring the means of subsistence which, in the final analysis, conditions the type of family institutions found in a society.7 Le Play analyzed geographical place as an environmental factor that influences means of subsistence and subsequently, family organization. In placing importance on geographical factors, he anticipated ecological theorists.

In general, the works of Park, Burgess, and McKenzie are considered the first ecological formulations. The field of ecology outlined by Park, Burgess, and McKenzie was confined to urban research and preoccupied with showing that non-human and cultural communities develop in comparable ways. Competition and dominance assumed a major role in the development of all types of ecological structures.8

In his ecological studies, Zorbaugh very aptly stated

---

the relationship between geographical space and social meaning. He described a natural area, as a "geographical area characterized both by a physical individuality and by the cultural characteristics of the people who live in it." He further stated that "natural areas tend to become distinct cultural areas as well."

The most cogent expression of this relationship is found in the formulations of Walter Firy. He contends that not only an impeditive quality should be ascribed to space, but also, the intrinsic quality "of being at times a symbol for certain cultural values that have become associated with a certain spatial area." Location or place explicitly or implicitly articulates social values and sentiments. There is no attempt to rule out the factors of competition, symbiosis, and succession. As Quinn maintains, living organisms "mutually influence one another through increasing or decreasing the limited supply of some

---


10 Ibid., p.47.

11 Ibid.


13 Ibid., p.140.
environmental factor upon which the other depends." Thus, there is no intention to rule out the effect of ecological interaction. The writer's contention is that ecological interaction alone does not explain the persistence of certain areas like "Beacon Hill" in Boston or the "Garden District" in New Orleans. These areas are sociologically significant because geographical space takes on social values.

This research does not attempt to illustrate how social values sustain ecological patterns. It takes this as an assumption. It further assumes, that geographical separation of subpopulations reflects their social separation. Ecological studies have pointed out that Negroes and whites are residentially segregated. This residential segregation reflects social segregation. In brief, residential distance is an index of social distance. These statements are not meant to be taken as testable hypotheses, but as working assumptions for the investigation of the problem at hand. More will be said about these assumptions and their implications in succeeding chapters.

Theoretically, two modes of emerging residential patterns exist. They may be called manipulative and

---

symbiotic. Using the aggregate as the frame of reference, the manipulative represents conscious planning and the symbiotic represents the unconscious and unplanned. Residential areas that are brought into existence by land speculators, entrepreneurs, city planners, and realtors are representative of the manipulative mode. Residential areas that emerge as products of competition and cooperation for the limited supply of living space are representative of the symbiotic mode.

Manipulative and symbiotic modes of emerging residential patterns seem to be interrelated. The process of suburbanization was possible, not only because there was a mass evacuation from deteriorating homes in the central city, but also, because there was an ample supply of better houses in the planned suburbs. When individuals, possessing more economic and social power, successfully win out in the competition with less fortunate people for the more desirable living areas, the symbiotic mode of emerging residential patterns is indicated. The overall effect is an orderly distribution of the different uses of urban land. This explains the partial validity of zonal analysis of urban structure. Many American cities can be roughly pictured by such zonal models. For example, the center of the city of Chicago represents, according to Duncan, the most undesirable dwelling area; while as one moves peripherally the
quality of the residential areas becomes more desirable. Although historically the center of the city might have been prime residential area, inhabited by high socioeconomic status individuals, with time the area becomes run down and is vacated by its original inhabitants and taken over by economically and socially deprived groups.

The two modes, taken individually or conjunctively, do not explain the persistence of such areas as "Beacon Hill" in Boston or the "Garden District" in New Orleans. Socio-cultural values can and do intervene either to change an existing residential pattern or to maintain existing patterns, initiated through manipulative or symbiotic mechanisms.

The "Garden District" is probably the best example that can be offered for illustrating this very point. The American sector in the 1870's included the present day "Irish Channel". The "Irish Channel" is usually thought of as the riverfront streets west of Canal Street. When the prosperous Americans moved from this area to the "Garden District", their Irish servants moved from near Canal Street to the riverfront streets west of Canal Street. The "poor" Irish took up occupancy in the residences discarded by the

---

Americans who moved further west into the area known as the "Garden District". As a result of this, the Irish sector shifted from the one time city of Lafayette to the present area known as the "Irish Channel". The "Garden District" became the residential haven for the prosperous Americans. During the past one hundred years, its desirability has been challenged only by the new suburbs built on land which was reclaimed from Lake Ponchartrain. The persistence of the "Garden District" can only be explained by strong positive sentiments its inhabitants have toward this area. Thus, as Firey maintains, values and sentiments do influence the way urban land is used.

III. RECENT STUDIES OF NEW ORLEANS

The ecological development of New Orleans has been extensively described by the late Harlan Gilmore. According to Gilmore, the early development of the city spread from an original T-shaped pattern. Since the development of New Orleans was limited to high ground crisscrossing low

---


swampy terrain, it is understandable that this T-shaped pattern represented the high ground that needed no draining. The T-shaped pattern was formed by the intersection of the Esplanade ridge and the alluvial ridge running along the river, as illustrated in Figure 1 on page 13. The original French settlement of New Orleans, the present site of the French Quarter, was located near the intersection of the two ridges. With the migration of Americans to New Orleans, the alluvial ridge west of the intersection of the two ridges became known as the American sector. East of the intersection was the Immigrant sector. It was this T-shaped pattern that acted as a nucleus for subsequent development. Residential expansion followed the high ground and for the American sector this meant a westward movement along the alluvial plain.

By the turn of the century, drainage techniques were increasingly perfected till by 1930 most of the swampy land was drained and no longer presented a natural barrier to population expansion. The American sector responded to this newly available residential land and expanded not only westward but northward as well. The Creole or French area expanded in both directions away from the Esplanade.

---

19 Ibid., p.392.

20 Ibid.
FIGURE 1

THE T-SHAPED PATTERN FORMED BY THE INTERSECTION OF THE ESPLANADE RIDGE AND THE ALLUVIAL RIDGE REPRESENTING THE ORIGINAL SETTLEMENT PATTERN IN NEW ORLEANS (BASED ON THE MAP BY HARLAN GILMORE, AMERICAN SOCIOLOGY REVIEW, AUGUST, 1944.)

--- ALLUVIAL RIDGE --- ESPLANADE RIDGE
ridge. The population pressure in this sector was not as strong as it was in the American sector. In both sectors, prior to the establishing of an effective drainage system and an efficient means of transportation, the Negroes inhabited fringe areas near their white employers. When the swamps were drained and the development of the street car facilitated movement to and from work, this Negro fringe area disappeared. Negro residential areas developed back toward the business district in the former swampy areas.

According to Gilmore, the new ecology of New Orleans is in a process of shifting to a zonal pattern which is still not complete. In a more recent study, Gilmore pointed out the great population increase in the city and the corresponding suburbanization. Several residential areas lost population during the 1940-1950 decade. The most notable of these was the French Quarter. Gilmore did not live long enough to see the reestablishing of the French Quarter as prime residential area. In the period from 1950 to 1967, the French Quarter has seen a blossoming of new

21 Ibid.
22 Ibid.
24 Ibid., p. 15.
residential development. It is very likely that this development will continue.

The lake front area continued to develop and sections of this area have challenged the "Garden District" as prime residential area. A middle class Negro area has emerged on the lake front and represents a most desirable Negro residential area.

A study of New Orleans with a different theoretical orientation is represented by the demographic analysis of Negroes in New Orleans by George Hillery, Jr. According to Hillery, Negroes are a minority people. Negro family life is more unstable as compared to whites. They receive less education and hold occupations that yield less prestige and smaller income. They have higher fertility and death rates and are less likely to be migrants. They are disproportionately concentrated in the younger age categories. Females are comparatively more numerous than males. Fewer Negroes achieve the right to vote. According to Hillery, these demographic differentials are explained by the presence of a self-fulfilling prophecy which maintains these differentials.

26 Ibid., p.184.
27 Ibid.
The above generalizations, outlined by Hillery for the 1950 census report, held for the 1960 census for those variables analyzed in this study. A detailed reference to these generalizations will be made in subsequent chapters.

This research project, as already outlined, is mainly concerned with testing several hypotheses which are derived either from ecological research or demographic theory. One of its major concerns will be in testing the feasibility of certain statistical models.

IV. HYPOTHESES

(1) The predominately Negro areas of the city are those categorized by high unemployment rates and low socioeconomic statuses.

(2) The predominately white areas are those categorized by high socioeconomic statuses and low unemployment rates.

(3) Residential segregation is quantitatively higher in the areas which are the most homogeneous with respect to income, occupation and education.

(4) The foreign stock (mainly Italian stock) are as residentially segregated from Negroes as are the native whites.

(5) The foreign stock resides in residential areas categorized by socioeconomic statuses not much different
from the native white population.

(6) Residential segregation is quantitatively higher in the areas which have the most stable populations.

V. RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This research project is confined to an analysis of certain variables recorded in the U. S. Census Tract Report for 1960.\(^2\) From these data, the following variables were chosen on the basis of their theoretical relevance to the hypotheses stated above:

**Independent variables (based on Census Tract totals)**

1. per cent unemployed males (all male civilians 14 years and over who were not working but looking for work)

2. per cent of the population 0-19 years

3. per cent of the population 20-64 years

4. per cent of the population 65 and over

5. per cent male

6. median family income

7. median years of school completed

8. mean of occupational prestige scores

9. segregation score for Italian stock (per cent individuals in a tract that are foreign born Italians or the children of Italian or mixed

---

parentage minus per cent expected on the basis of the city total)

10. segregation score for foreign stock (per cent individuals in a tract that are foreign born or children of foreign or mixed parentage minus the per cent expected on the basis of the city total)

11. total migration (per cent of the population five years and older listing a different residence in 1955)

12. in-migration (per cent of the population five years and older listing a residence outside the S.M.S.A. of New Orleans in 1955)

13. intra-city migration (per cent of the population five years and older with a different residence in the S.M.S.A. of New Orleans in 1955)

14. income heterogeneity (coefficient of variability for family income)

15. educational heterogeneity (coefficient of variability for school years completed for individuals 25 years and older)

16. occupational heterogeneity (coefficient of variability for occupational prestige scores)

17. per cent of total population residing in a census tract

18. per cent houses renter occupied

Dependent variables (based on Census Tract totals)

1. per cent Negro (99 per cent of non-white population are Negro)

2. segregation score (per cent non-white individuals residing in a tract minus per cent expected on the basis of city totals)

Census tracts were the areal units investigated.

Only those tracts within the city limits (Orleans Parish)
were analyzed. Tracts with a population of less than one thousand (non-residential) were not included. Using the data from 151 census tracts, several aspects of correlational analysis were used to test the above hypotheses. Total correlation analysis was used to show the separate contribution of independent variables in statistically "explaining" a dependent variable. The correlation between per cent of the tract population 0-19 years and per cent Negro represented a total correlation coefficient. Partial correlation analysis was used when it was useful to "control" for confounding variables. For example, it was important to know if the correlation between per cent Negro and per cent intra-city migrants disappeared when the per cent renter occupied houses was controlled. The multiple regression was used when the consideration was to ascertain the combined contribution of several independent variables in "explaining" variation of a single dependent variable. It is obvious that occupation, education, and income are all negatively correlated with per cent Negro. It was useful to know the combined contribution of these three variables toward "explaining" variation in per cent Negro, rather than listing total correlations separately. Since these status scores were so strongly related to per cent Negro, they had to be controlled when other relationships were analyzed. The multiple-partial correlation coefficient is suitable for
such problems. The relationship between the heterogeneity scores and per cent Negro, controlling for the three socio-economic status scores, was analyzed by this model.

Finally, contingency tables were used to illustrate the same relationships that were subjected to correlational analysis. The purpose of this was to compare the two techniques and to further corroborate the research findings.

A more detailed discussion of certain variables can be found in the appendix, along with problems of non-linearity and interaction. A more mathematical treatment of the four strategies in correlational analysis is also presented; namely, total correlation, partial correlation, multiple regression, and multiple-partial correlation.
CHAPTER II

SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS PROFILE OF RACIAL AREAS

There is no shortage of data to demonstrate the low socioeconomic statuses of Negro areas in American cities. Whether one takes northern or southern cities, the same results are obtained.¹ An attempt will be made in this chapter to show that this generalization is also applicable for the city of New Orleans. Since occupation, income, and education are the most useful parameters of socioeconomic status, they were the indices employed. In addition, other characteristics of Negro areas will be noted, such as, unemployment, home ownership, age status, and population size. Other characteristics of Negro areas will be presented in later chapters.

Although correlational analysis was employed in this study, the following profile is almost wholly descriptive. However, the data presented here did substantiate hypothesis 1 (The predominately Negro areas of the city are those categorized by high unemployment rates and low socioeconomic statuses.) and 2 (The predominately white areas are those

categorized by high socioeconomic statuses and low unemployment rates.). This observation is not particularly illuminating since most urban researchers have emphasized this for the American cities that have been studied. The only claim made here is that New Orleans conforms to this rather well known picture.

In keeping with the previously stated design, this study supplemented correlational analysis with dichotomized data for methodological comparisons. Negro areas were defined as areas with a 50 percent Negro population or more. "Mixed" areas were defined as areas with between 20 per cent and 49 per cent Negro population. White areas were defined as areas with 19 per cent or less Negro population. Whether correlational analysis or tabular data were used, the same relationships were observed, as will be presently shown.

I. NEGRO AND WHITE AREAS COMPARED

Socioeconomic status. After calculating the multiple correlation coefficient \( R^2 \) using per cent Negro as the dependent variable and occupational prestige, median school years completed, and median family income as the independent variables, a very high coefficient was obtained. In fact, the \( R^2 \) was equal to .71. It should be recalled that the \( R^2 \) should be interpreted as "explained" variation. In
addition, all three variables were negatively correlated with per cent Negro, as is shown in these results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation coefficients when correlated with per cent Negro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational prestige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results demonstrate that the Negro areas were also the low socioeconomic status areas. In statistical terms, these results mean that these indices of socioeconomic status "explain" 71 per cent of the variance of per cent Negro.\(^2\)

That is, 71 per cent of the variation in per cent Negro can be predicted by these three indices.

When these socioeconomic status variables were dichotomized, the same results were observed. Tables I, II, and III on pages 24, 25, and 26, illustrate that it was the Negro areas that were low in income, occupational prestige, and educational attainment.

**Unemployment and occupancy status.** The correlation coefficient between per cent unemployed and per cent Negro was .66; a coefficient high enough to characterize Negro areas as having unemployment problems. Furthermore, the correlation coefficient between per cent housing units which

TABLE I
MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME AND PER CENT NEGRO (BASED ON TRACT DATA FROM 151 CENSUS TRACTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME</th>
<th>Negro areas (50-100% Negro)</th>
<th>&quot;Mixed&quot; areas (20-49% Negro)</th>
<th>White areas (0-19% Negro)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,258 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,257 and under</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II

OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE AND PER CENT NEGRO (BASED ON TRACT DATA FROM 151 CENSUS TRACTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORE</th>
<th>Negro areas (50-100% Negro)</th>
<th>&quot;Mixed&quot; areas (20-49% Negro)</th>
<th>White areas (0-19% Negro)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 and less</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN SCHOOL YRS. COMPLETED FOR INDIVIDUALS 25 AND OLDER</td>
<td>Negro areas (50-100% Negro)</td>
<td>&quot;Mixed&quot; areas (20-49% Negro)</td>
<td>White areas (0-19% Negro)</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8 yrs. and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.7 yrs. and under</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were renter occupied and per cent Negro was .43; a fact which sheds some light on internal movement in the city, since presumably home ownership restrains internal movement to some extent.

**Age categories.** In addition, correlational analysis revealed that the Negro areas were inhabited by a younger population than were the white areas, as the following data reveal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation coefficients when correlated with per cent Negro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per cent 0 to 19 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent 20 to 64 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent 65 yrs. and over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results are to be expected, since other studies have revealed that Negroes traditionally have a high fertility rate. This fact, plus a higher mortality rate and differential migration would be sufficient to explain the age distribution of Negro areas.

**Population size.** A measure of population size was included in the analysis. Ideally, the best indicator of overpopulation is a measure of density. However, since

---


the costs involved in measuring density outweighed the importance of the measure for this study, a more simple and less precise measure was employed. The per cent of the city's total residing in a given tract was correlated with per cent Negro and the coefficient was .36. In other words, the areas with the largest population were more often Negro than white areas. Since the white areas included the large suburban tracts, the foregoing result implies that the Negro areas were the most populated areas.

Geographical distribution of racial areas. In terms of geographical distribution, Figure 2 on page 29 reveals that the Negro areas were not centered in the business district, but rather extended from one end of the city to the other. The distribution apparently did not conform to any zonal or sector model. Although most of the Negro areas were coterminous, several isolated areas were observable. This, plus the fact of the rapid development of the eastern section of the city opened to Negroes, has vitiated against the severe overcrowding that occurs when a rapidly growing population is not allowed to expand its territorial holdings.

II. THE "MIXED" AREAS

The "mixed" areas represented areas which were intermediate between the Negro areas and the white areas as
FIGURE 2

THE DISTRIBUTION OF NEGROES BY CENSUS TRACTS IN THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS (BASED ON DATA FROM BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, JANUARY, 1963)

- 50-100% Negro
- 20-49% Negro
- 0-19% Negro
- Non-residential
Tables I, II, and III illustrate. They represented a statistical category and not a social area, since they were purely artificial constructs. Along socioeconomic status lines, at least, they represented a midway point between the two extremes; namely, the white areas and the Negro areas. Except for intra-city migration presented in Chapter V, they could be differentiated from the other two areas only on the basis of racial composition. For this reason, they will be dropped from future references and only passing recognition will be given to them.

III. IMPLICATIONS

The foregoing description illustrates how area not only has a geographical dimension, but a social dimension as well. That is to say that prestige, whether high or low, is attached to the "place" a person or group resides.\(^5\) In the struggle for the most desirable living space, the economically and socially fortunate individuals succeed in occupying the most desirable or most prestigious areas in the city. This in turn adds to the desirability and prestige of the area. Focusing in the other direction, prestige becomes attached to an area by virtue of the prestige of its

inhabitants. In the case of New Orleans, the most prestigious areas were occupied by whites. The least prestigious areas were occupied by Negroes.

In this study, the areas under investigation have been categorized as Negro, "mixed", and white. This is a statistical breakdown; however, the data suggest that these areas coincide with social status. The claim here is not that these are natural areas in the city, which of course is a testable hypothesis, but rather that prestige is attached to areas. By implication this fact becomes the focal point of residential segregation. What is implied here is that the prestige of an area is taken into account in one's choice of a domicile. This is implied; not demonstrated. It may be a fruitful starting point for further research.

It may be both interesting and revealing to ascertain what effect real estate agencies had on residential segregation. For what portion of the present residential patterns were they responsible? A study such as this cannot take such things into account, nor does it purport to show how local laws and ordinances have effected this pattern. What was shown here was only a rather brief description of the pattern as it was revealed from an analysis of census data.

---

The residential segregation considered above was based on race as defined by the U. S. Census. It would be erroneous to think this is the only basis of segregation. Although racial segregation is the most apparent, it is by no means the only basis for residential segregation. In the next chapter, residential segregation along socioeconomic status lines will be considered. The relationship between this mode of segregation and racial segregation will be given specific consideration. In Chapter IV, residential segregation along ethnic lines will be considered.

In conclusion, Negro areas coincided with, and were in large measure, the low socioeconomic status areas. Socioeconomic status, as measured here, reflected the prestige of the areas. The Negro areas were also characterized by high unemployment rates, a fact which also reflected the low socioeconomic status of these areas.

In terms of age distribution, the Negro areas were heavily populated by younger inhabitants from 0 to 19 years of age. This fact is consistent with the traditional finding that Negroes have high fertility rates.

---


Furthermore, Negroes were more apt to rent than were their white counterparts. This is a reflection of their low socioeconomic status. It also has important implications for internal movements, which will be considered in Chapter V.

Finally, Negro areas were the most populated areas, and by implication the most crowded areas in the city.
CHAPTER III

RESIDENTIAL DIFFERENTIATION: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS SEGREGATION AND RACIAL SEGREGATION

In the previous chapter, three types of racial areas were delineated; namely, the Negro, "mixed", and white areas. It was shown that these areas were congruent with particular socioeconomic status areas; whereas, Negro areas were populated with individuals with low socioeconomic statuses, white areas were populated with individuals with high socioeconomic statuses, and "mixed" areas were populated with individuals that lay somewhere in between.

Essentially what is involved is residential segregation along two different axes. On the one hand, there is segregation by race or ethnicity and on the other hand, segregation by socioeconomic status. This chapter deals with the relationship between these two processes and their residential differentiation of the city.

The segregation analyzed in this study was limited to residential segregation. That is to say, the primary concern here was residential propinquity. For American cities studied, the two modes of residential segregation mentioned above are considered to be operative. Taeuber and Taeuber, in a recent study, presented a methodological model for
measuring the effects of these two modes of residential segregation.¹ Their main concern however, seems to have been exploring to what extent economic discrimination "explains" residential segregation. Their conclusion was that eliminating economic discrimination does not alter the present patterns of residential segregation. In other words, economic discrimination did not statistically "explain" the fact that whites with high socioeconomic statuses were residually more proximate to whites with low socioeconomic statuses than they were to Negroes with high socioeconomic statuses. Their strategy was to use racial residential segregation as a dependent variable and economic discrimination as an independent variable. This writer's strategy was not only to try to account for racial residential segregation and socioeconomic status segregation, but to show that these two modes of segregation are related and together are the main modes of residential differentiation.

Hypothesis 3 stated that the most racially segregated areas would be the most homogeneous areas in terms of occupation, income, and education. In other words, homogeneity was taken to mean socioeconomic status segregation.

Originally, it was believed that the homogeneous areas would be either predominately white or predominately Negro. In short, the expectation was that both the Negro areas and the white areas would be residentially homogeneous, and the racially mixed areas would be residentially heterogeneous. The results revealed however, that although the white areas were indeed homogeneous with respect to income, occupation, and education; the Negro areas were far less so by comparison. The racially "mixed" areas were somewhere in between.

I. THE RESULTS

The multiple regression coefficient. Income, occupational and educational heterogeneity were used as indicators of socioeconomic status segregation. When these three variables were used in a multiple regression model as the independent variables and per cent Negro used as the dependent variable, the multiple regression coefficient turned out to be .75. All three variables had a positive correlation with per cent Negro, .28, .84, and .71 respectively. It should be noted that this multiple regression coefficient should be interpreted as statistically "explaining" 75 percent of the variation in per cent Negro.² Furthermore, it

should be recalled that the three socioeconomic status measures, median family income, median school years completed, and the mean of the occupational prestige scores together "explained" 71 per cent. All six variables were highly intercorrelated, as is shown by these correlation coefficients:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Occ. prestige</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inc. heterogeneity</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occ. heterogeneity</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>-.93</td>
<td>-.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. heterogeneity</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>-.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The multiple partial coefficient. Because of these results, it was necessary to show that these heterogeneity measures were still predictive when income, occupation, and education were controlled. Fortunately, a rather simple model that is seldom used by sociologists can demonstrate this predictiveness. The multiple-partial correlation coefficient is useful when variables that are highly correlated with a dependent variable need to be controlled in order to ascertain what relationship the dependent variable has with other more theoretically important independent variables.³

This model can reveal the effect of one or more independent variables while holding constant other independent

³Ibid., pp.350-351.
variables. Actually, the confounding variables are not held constant, but are adjusted in order to take on a common value. When this was done with the above variables, the multiple-partial correlation between income heterogeneity, occupational heterogeneity, educational heterogeneity, and per cent Negro (controlling for median family income, mean of the occupational prestige scores, and median school years completed) turned out to be .17. In other words, these variables statistically "explained" variation in per cent Negro, even after income, education, and occupation were controlled. Statistically, heterogeneity measures were more important predictors of per cent Negro than socioeconomic status measures. When the model was changed around to control for the heterogeneity measures, a coefficient of .02 was obtained. Clearly, the heterogeneity measures "explained" more variation in per cent Negro than did the three socioeconomic status measures.

Corroborative data. The relationships between the heterogeneity measures and racial areas are illustrated in Tables IV, V, and VI on pages 39, 40, and 41. Briefly, these tables illustrate that equivalent results were obtained whether correlational analysis or cross tabulation was used. These tables were constructed by using the mean as the dividing line for each variable considered.

Another model was employed in order to test the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME HETEROGENEITY SCORE</th>
<th>Negro areas (50-100% Negro)</th>
<th>&quot;Mixed&quot; areas (20-49% Negro)</th>
<th>White areas (0-19% Negro)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.68 and over</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.67 and under</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V

OCCUPATIONAL HETEROGENEITY AND PER CENT NEGRO
(BASED ON TRACT DATA FROM 151 CENSUS TRACTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATIONAL HETEROGENEITY SCORE</th>
<th>Negro areas (50-100% Negro)</th>
<th>&quot;Mixed&quot; areas (20-49% Negro)</th>
<th>White areas (0-19% Negro)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.43 and over</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.42 and under</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VI

**EDUCATIONAL HETEROGENEITY AND PER CENT NEGRO**
(BASED ON TRACT DATA FROM 151 CENSUS TRACTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATIONAL HETEROGENEITY SCORE</th>
<th>Negro areas (50-100% Negro)</th>
<th>&quot;Mixed&quot; areas (20-49% Negro)</th>
<th>White areas (0-19% Negro)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.43 and over</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.42 and under</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
original hypothesis. It incorporated segregation scores as the dependent variable, since the residential segregation of the races was the main interest. This model was discarded since it revealed that the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable (segregation) turned out to be non-linear.\(^4\) Since linearity is assumed in the multiple regression model, these data were dropped. A consideration of non-linearity can be found in the appendix.

II. INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

The above results indicate that the heterogeneity measures were important variables in "explaining" variation in per cent Negro from one census tract to another. They also illustrate that the socioeconomic status segregation, as measured by the three heterogeneity measures, was characteristic of white areas. In contrast, the Negro areas had much less socioeconomic status segregation. Finally, the three heterogeneity measures were strongly correlated with the three socioeconomic status measures, as was already shown. The two sets of variables were related in an inverse manner. Briefly stated, heterogeneity was inversely related to socioeconomic status.

It should be recalled that one of the main

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 312.
assumptions of this study was that these heterogeneity measures were indices of socioeconomic status segregation or residential stratification.

III. INDICATORS OF RESIDENTIAL STRATIFICATION

The heterogeneity measures. Statistically the heterogeneity measures are measures of dispersion. That is, they represent the amount of spread in a distribution. For the sake of illustration, assume that one tract in the city has two thousand individuals, twenty-five years and older, and all have completed between ten and twelve years of formal schooling. The coefficient of variability (heterogeneity) for this distribution would be much smaller than if the range was from two to sixteen years of school completed. In the former case, one would say that the tract was composed of individuals who were very similar in their educational attainment. In the latter case, one would say that at least in educational attainment, the individuals were widely different. The coefficient of variability is a measure of how similar are the scores in a distribution. Thus, the size of the coefficient of variability varies inversely to the similarity of scores (homogeneity) and directly with their dissimilarity (heterogeneity). In this

---

5Ibid., pp. 73-74
case, the scores represent income, occupational prestige, and number of school years completed. Whenever a high heterogeneity score was obtained, a great amount of spread was indicated, for example, a large number of people who differ widely in income, occupational prestige, and number of school years completed.

If individuals were randomly located throughout the city one would expect to find a very high heterogeneity score for each tract. However, what was found for white areas was that individuals with similar socioeconomic statuses were residentially located near each other and segregated from individuals with statuses widely differing from theirs. On the other hand, the Negro areas had very high scores which indicated a greater spread and diversity of statuses. The conclusion was drawn that the individuals who inhabited the white areas were segregated along socioeconomic status lines, but the individuals who inhabited the Negro areas were far less so by comparison. Socioeconomic status segregation was assumed here to be synonymous with residential stratification. By residential stratification is meant not only that along status lines different areas of the city ran the gambit from high to low; but that in each area, whether high or low, there was a great similarity in the statuses of the individual inhabitants.

The coefficient of variability employed here was
chosen as an indicator of socioeconomic status segregation, because it reflects all of the socioeconomic statuses of the inhabitants of a given area.

**Index of dissimilarity.** The index of dissimilarity used by Taeuber and Taeuber employed the census categories of standard and substandard dwelling units. The residential segregation of these two kinds of dwelling units were taken as indicators of economic discrimination. Otis D. Duncan, who developed this index, first used the index to measure the residential segregation of occupational groups. It is simple to use and the assumptions on which it is based are realistic. It was not useful for this study, for the index of dissimilarity gives the absolute areal segregation of two "groups" only. That is, it gives an overall areal separation of two "groups" within some specified area. In order to use this index for the thirteen income class intervals alone, one would have had \( \binom{N}{r} \frac{(N-r-1)!}{r!} \), or 78 indices to compute for the different income intervals. Clearly the index of dissimilarity is not appropriate when more than two categories need to be reflected. The coefficient of variability was more practical in satisfying this need. It has

---


the added advantage of being based on the standard deviation, a well known and frequently used measure among sociologists. In fact, it is nothing more than the standard deviation of a distribution divided by the mean of that distribution. Its big disadvantage is that it cannot be interpreted directly in terms of which income "groups" are separated areally. This is as it should be since it is a measure that reflects all of the scores in a distribution.

IV. IMPLICATIONS

If the heterogeneity measures are indicators of residential stratification, then the above results indicate that white areas were residentially more stratified than were the Negro areas.

It is understandable that this is the case. Patterns of prejudice and discrimination restricted Negro occupancy to only certain areas within the city. Fewer possibilities were open to Negro residents. It is not implied that the process whereby a city becomes racially segregated and residentially stratified is the product of individual choice alone. Clearly, the two related processes are much more complex than that. It is not the main concern of this writer to explore the many dimensions of these processes. It is only necessary to comment that residential stratification was hindered in the Negro areas by the existing
patterns of prejudice and discrimination and the practices of the local realtors. Because of these and other factors, the Negroes lived only in designated areas which were composed of individuals that occupied diverse socioeconomic statuses. With one or two exceptions, all the Negro tracts in the city were composed of Negroes with widely differing incomes, occupations, and educational attainments.

These results are consistent with Taeuber and Taeuber's findings. They indicated that although there has been an increase in socioeconomic status segregation in the Negro communities of American cities studied, including New Orleans, during the 1950 to 1960 decade; on the whole, the amount of socioeconomic status segregation was less than that found among the white population.  

V. RAMIFICATION

Stratification studies. The above results may have important ramifications for stratification studies. If the distinction between stratum and class is taken to be a valid one, it may be said that the proceeding results indicate a residentially stratified population for the white areas.

Strata can be distinguished from classes on several grounds, however, it was not the concern of this study to

---

review that distinction. It is necessary to clarify the way the term strata was employed here and what the writer thinks the theorists on stratification mean by the concept "class". Strata here represented statistical categories of subpopulations with similar socioeconomic statuses and similar locations of residence. A stratum is nothing more than individuals with similar incomes, education, and occupations residing in areas with others that have similar socioeconomic statuses. The term "class", is taken to mean a group of individuals with similar socioeconomic statuses, common interests and styles of living, corporate values, and a common identity or class consciousness. The phrase, "common interests, styles of living, and corporate values", seems to imply patterns of consumption. If this is indeed implied, then the kind of residence and its location must be part of that style of living.

According to the above data, there was evidence for the existence of strata. Although there is no attempt to equate these strata with classes, it would seem that strata are necessary conditions for class formation. Broom argues that a homogeneous stratum is a necessary condition but not a sufficient condition for the emergence of a class.9

Accordingly, it would be the homogeneous stratum and not the heterogeneous one that could best meet this condition.

Social distance. The above argument brings in relief a still more fundamental question. Is there a real connection between residential propinquity and social distance? What is implied by social distance is the probability of two subpopulations sharing common interests and values. The social distance between Negroes and whites is reflected in the residential segregation between these two racial groups for American cities studied to date. Concerning the residential segregation of ethnic groups, Lieberson has shown that for the ethnic groups studied, there was a close correspondence between residential segregation and assimilation. An assimilation of an ethnic group can only mean the social distance between it and the native population has decreased. So the above assumption is at least given partial substantiation. Can the same assumption be made for residentially segregated socioeconomic strata? The assumption is believed to be a realistic one. One can conceive of residential segregation, whatever mode it takes, as being a limiting factor in the formation of common interests, values, and styles of life. No causal relationship is

---

implied. Clearly the corporate interests and values might well come prior in time to, and be a significant determinant of, residential stratification. A conceptual scheme that relates the two processes in probability terms would be more accurate. That is, given a certain level of residential stratification, there follows a certain probability of also finding common interests and corporate values. These statements are not meant to be statements of fact. It is hoped that they are the crude beginnings of testable hypotheses.

In summary, what has been presented was an empirical residential differentiation of the city of New Orleans based on socioeconomic status, socioeconomic status heterogeneity, and racial composition. The implication that this differentiation might have for stratification research was explored. An attempt was made to show that ecological variables have relevancy for stratification research.

Finally, in showing the importance of socioeconomic status heterogeneity, the multiple-partial correlation model was employed. It is hoped that its utility was demonstrated for sociological research. A more extended treatment of this model can be found in the appendix.
Residential segregation in the city has already been analyzed along two main axes; namely, racial segregation and socioeconomic status segregation. There exists still another mode of segregation. As ecological studies have illustrated, besides the Negroes, other racial or ethnic groups are typically residentially isolated from the native white populations. The racial or ethnic groups can, and often do, become residentially isolated from each other. Within each racial or ethnic group, there may or may not develop a socioeconomic status differentiation. As was demonstrated in the previous chapter, this socioeconomic status segregation may bolster and to some extent help maintain racial or ethnic segregation. To what extent are the foreign stock, Italians in particular, spatially isolated from the native white population? To what extent are they spatially isolated from the Negro population? This chapter is an attempt to substantiate hypothesis 4 (The foreign stock are as residentially segregated from Negroes as are

---

the native whites.) and hypothesis 5 (The foreign stock reside in residential areas categorized by socioeconomic statuses not much different from the native white population.). Before attempting to substantiate these hypotheses, a brief historical account of the three main ethnic groups that have emigrated to New Orleans would be fruitful.

I. IMMIGRATION TO NEW ORLEANS

Excluding the early migration of the French, New Orleans has had three major ethnic groups to settle within the city limits. In chronological order, they were the Irish, the Germans, and the Italians.

The Irish. The Irish began migrating to New Orleans around 1803. The decade from 1850 to 1860 represented the peak immigration of the Irish to the city of New Orleans. By the middle of the 1850's, they represented the most numerous ethnic group. At this time, there were over twenty thousand Irishmen in the city, representing almost twenty per cent of the white population. The next decade saw the decline of the Irish migration to the city, till by 1900 there existed only 5,398 foreign born Irishmen within the

---


In 1960, the census recorded a scant 2,091 either foreign born Irish or natives of Irish or mixed parentage. Consequently, the Irish account for very few of the foreign stock in this study.

The Germans. The German emigration to New Orleans started later and ended later than the Irish emigration. In 1850, there were 11,425 German immigrants in the city. By 1870, the number had risen to an all time high of 15,239. By 1890, there were 11,338 and the 1960 census reports revealed only 6,031 Germans either foreign born or natives of German or mixed parentage. The German foreign stock element represented the second largest foreign stock element in the city. They were exceeded only by the Italians who, bases on the 1960 census reports, represented the largest single foreign stock element.

The Italians. In 1910, the census report recorded

---


7 Ibid., p.12.

8,066 foreign born Italians in the city. Presumably, this represented the largest single amount recorded for any census year. In 1960, over 16,000 Italians either foreign born or natives of Italian or mixed parentage resided in the city. Since the Italians were the last of the three European groups to come to the city, they represented the most numerous ethnic element in the city. Most of the Irish and the Germans who arrived earlier are now deceased. Their children and grandchildren were recorded as native whites, since most were second and third generation Americans.

It would be apropos to mention something by way of characterizing this Italian element, since they represented the most numerous element (30 per cent) of the 54,045 individuals referred to by the United States census as the foreign stock.

Historical data on the Italians in New Orleans are most incomplete. However, surveying the statistics on immigration compiled by various departments of the United States government and combining these with the many conversations the author has had with the Italians in the city, the following sketch is believed to be fairly accurate.

The Italian immigrants who first left home to come to

---

the New World were predominately male. The Italian immigrants coming to New Orleans and other parts of Louisiana were no exception. The later part of the nineteenth century and the opening of the twentieth century was the period of heaviest migration of the Italians to New Orleans. During this period the males far out numbered the females. By 1915, the number of males and females immigrating were almost the same. During the period from 1915 to 1920, women and children came to join their husbands and fathers. The interesting fact about the immigration to New Orleans and Louisiana at this time was that most of the immigrants were southern Italians or Sicilians. Few professionals were found in their ranks. Semi-skilled and unskilled laborers, including farm laborers made up their ranks. In short, they were from the economically depressed, agricultural areas of Italy. They were poor by American standards. One immigrant reported to the writer that the only passage he and others could afford to the United States was on board a cargo ship


11 Ibid., p. 41.

hauling a boat load of mules to the New World.

This brief sketch is based in part on the immigration data for Italians residing in Louisiana. Since most of the Italians residing in the state settled in New Orleans, the statistics seem to be applicable for the Italians within the city. Because of this difficulty however, the above sketch should be considered a tentative one.

It was these immigrants and their children that made up what the census refers to as the Italian foreign stock. By 1960, very few foreign born Italians were recorded for the city, so by and large the Italian foreign stock can be taken to mean natives, who were children of Italian or mixed parentage. The distribution of foreign stock elements in the city of New Orleans for 1960 is listed in Table VII on page 57. As the table illustrates, most of the foreign stock were Europeans. The Italian stock were the most numerous (30 per cent), followed by German stock (11.2 per cent), United Kingdom stock (5.5 per cent) and Irish stock (3.9 per cent). It is the residential distribution of these individuals that was of major concern.

II. STUDIES OF ETHNIC SEGREGATION

Typically, the ecologists have pictured the immigrants and their children as being residentially isolated. Duncan and Lieberson reported that the foreign born in
TABLE VII
THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE FOREIGN STOCK ELEMENTS IN NEW ORLEANS (BASED ON THE 1960 CENSUS TRACT REPORT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foreign stock</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2958</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland (Eire)</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>6031</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>16097</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1622</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other and not reported</td>
<td>18156</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>54045</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.30%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
selected American cities were residually segregated from the native whites. Their segregation indices ranged from the lowest for the foreign elements from England and Wales, to the highest for individuals from Lituania, with the Italians ranking very high. The traditional picture of immigrants concentrated in small areas in large urban centers is still largely true according to these authors' data. Names such as "Chinatown" and "Little Italy" have more than just historical significance. This residential isolation, whether by choice, or by chance, not only helped to preserve the old customs but also impeded assimilation.

One recent urban study has pointed out that the old ecological correlate between per cent foreign born and low economic status has decreased from 1914 to 1950 for the twenty cities studied. However, most observers depict the foreign born as residing in low socioeconomic status areas. Shevky reports that the foreign born were not only concentrated in the lower socioeconomic status areas, but were also residually proximate to Negroes. This is


particularly true for the Mexicans, Orientals, and Italians. Duncan and Lieberson also reported that the Italians were residentially proximate to Negroes, along with other ethnic groups.\textsuperscript{16} It would not be altogether appropriate to compare these findings with the writer's since this study is based on foreign stock and not the foreign born. However, it would be helpful to know whether or not the above generalizations held for the children of the foreign born in New Orleans.

III. RESULTS

Indices of dissimilarity. The data based on the 1960 census tracts for New Orleans was used to compute three indices of dissimilarity: (1) between the total foreign stock and the native whites, (2) between the total foreign stock and the Negroes, and (3) between the Negroes and the native whites. Since there were only approximately fifty-four thousand foreign stock individuals in the city, it would be unrealistic to use single elements, such as the Italian stock, to base an index of dissimilarity. Although the Italian stock represented the largest single element, they accounted for 30 per cent of the total. An index computed on such a small base figure would be of doubtful

significance.

The index of dissimilarity is referred to by its originator as an index of segregation, when computed to measure the areal separation of racial or ethnic groups. Its interpretation is both simple and direct. It can be interpreted as the per cent of any subpopulation that must move to a different area in order to make its distribution identical with that of some other subpopulation. Thus, an index of 50 between Negroes and whites would mean that 50 per cent of the Negroes must change residence in order to be distributed in each area in the same proportion as the whites. The index ranges from 0, which represents no segregation, to 100 which represents complete segregation.

The index between Negroes and native whites for New Orleans turned out to be 68.6. A rather high degree of segregation is indicated. The index between the total foreign stock and Negroes turned out to be 67.2. These results indicate that the foreign stock were as residentially segregated from Negroes as were the native whites. Therefore, these data support hypothesis 5 which states that the foreign stock are as residentially segregated from Negroes as are the native whites.

---

The residential segregation between the foreign stock and the native whites was only 14.9. It would seem that residential propinquity between the foreign born and the Negroes was not true for the city of New Orleans under these conditions.

**Correlation coefficients.** Furthermore, correlational analysis lead to the same conclusion, as is shown by these correlation coefficients:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation coefficients when correlated with per cent Negro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italian stock segregation score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign stock segregation score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These correlations are high and in the predicted direction. They are consistent with the previous results, which revealed that the Negroes and the foreign stock were residually segregated from each other.

**The multiple regression coefficient.** In addition, the multiple regression coefficient between the three socioeconomic status scores (income, occupational prestige, and education) and the Italian segregation score was .32. The multiple regression coefficient, substituting the total foreign stock segregation score for the Italian stock segregation score, was .57. The socioeconomic status scores were all positively correlated with the Italian stock segregation
score, as shown in these results:

| Correlation coefficients when correlated with Italian stock segregation score |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Income                        | 0.27      |
| Occupational prestige         | 0.39      |
| Education                     | 0.21      |

These socioeconomic status scores were also positively correlated with the foreign stock segregation score, as is demonstrated in these results:

| Correlation coefficients when correlated with foreign stock segregation score |
|-------------------------------|-----------|
| Income                        | 0.52      |
| Occupational prestige         | 0.71      |
| Education                     | 0.59      |

These findings illustrate three important facts. First, they illustrate that the Italian stock and the total foreign stock were residentially segregated from the Negroes. Secondly, the foreign stock was not isolated or segregated from the native whites. Thirdly, the foreign stock was not located in areas that can be considered to have low socioeconomic status characteristics.

IV. IMPLICATIONS

What are the implications of these findings? If one accepts the assumption that residential distance is related
to social distance, then one can conclude that the foreign stock in New Orleans were not socially isolated from the native white population. The results would seem to imply that the Italians and other foreign stock elements had the necessary conditions to develop interests and values in common with the native white population. Therefore, they possessed the necessary conditions for their assimilation. Similarly, if the residential distance between the foreign stock and the Negroes reflects the social distance between these two subpopulations, then it would seem that the foreign stock had already incorporated part of the value system of the native whites. That part of the value system that evaluates the Negro population is indicated. Finally, these results imply that the foreign stock (the Italian stock in particular) were not the socially deprived and the economically impoverished group of the past generation. The implication is that the foreign stock has been assimilated. This is inferred and not demonstrated. These data are consistent with an assimilated population. This is not to claim that there are no unfavorable attitudes among the native white population toward the foreign stock. There was no way of knowing, on the basis of this study, whether there were or were not. The only implication is that the above results seem to be incompatible with extensive patterns of discrimination directed at the foreign stock.
V. THE HISTORICAL RESIDENTIAL SETTLEMENT OF
THE IRISH, GERMAN, AND ITALIAN IMMIGRANTS

Although there is no basis for comparing these results with results obtained from other urban studies, one can compare these results with historical accounts of the residential settlement patterns of the three major ethnic groups i.e. the Irish, the Germans, and the Italians.

Figure 3 on page 65 illustrates the historical settlement of the Irish (1803-1860), the Germans (1850-1900), and the Italians (1870-1920) in the city of New Orleans. The main areas of settlement were Algiers, Carrollton, the area from Esplanade to St. Bernard, the area between Felicity and Toledano streets, and the riverfront streets of Magazine and Tchoupitoulas.

The Irish and the Germans. Historically, the Germans settled in the municipality that ran from Esplanade to Elysian Fields. This area became known as "Little Saxony". The Carrollton area also absorbed a number of German immigrants, as well as, Algiers on the west bank and the one time city of Lafayette (present day Felicity to Toledano streets). For the most part, the German immigrants lived in the poorer sections of the city. No claim is made that prosperous immigrants could not be found in the city.

FIGURE 3

THE HISTORICAL RESIDENTIAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE IRISH (1803-1860), THE GERMANS (1850-1900), AND THE ITALIANS (1870-1920) IN THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

1-Irish  2-German  3-Italian
Indeed, there were prosperous individuals from all three national groups. What is being claimed is that the majority of these immigrants lived in the poorer sections of the city.

The so called "Poor Third" was an immigrant section for both the Irish and the Germans.\textsuperscript{19} This was one of the poorer sections of the city. It ran from the Esplanade ridge to the St. Bernard Parish line. From Almonaster to the parish line, the main foreign element was the Irish.\textsuperscript{20} The Irish also settled west of Canal Street. Many Irishmen, like the Germans, settled in the so called city of Lafayette and across the river in Algiers. Niehaus reported that Irish servants moved into residences in the city of Lafayette vacated by the prosperous Americans who moved into the Garden District.\textsuperscript{21} This district, even today, is a prime residential area. By this internal shift of peoples, the "Irish Channel" was transferred from just west of Canal Street to the riverfront streets of Tchoupitoulas and Magazine, which to this day bear the name "the Irish Channel".

\textbf{The Italians.} With respect to the Italians, the

\textsuperscript{20}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 30.
\textsuperscript{21}\textit{Ibid.}
picture is even more spotty. The Italians, as already stated, were the last immigrant group to arrive, except for the Latin Americans of recent decades. They came in smaller numbers than did the Germans and the Irish. Presumably, they settled in the immigrant section (east of Esplanade Avenue, around St. Claude Avenue). The existence of an Italian Church in the French Quarter gives witness to the fact that they also settled there. Algiers and Carrollton were also areas of settlement, for both areas contain Italian families of long residence.

In short, this brief historical account points out that these ethnic groups were segregated to some extent from the native white population. They also resided in areas that were considered the poorer areas. Today, the children of these immigrants occupy a more favorable position in the residential distribution of the population. No longer are they segregated from the native white population. No longer are they constrained to live in the poorer sections of the city. In brief, they have entered into the mainstream of American life. Their fathers' hopes to find a better life in America were realized in them.
In the proceeding chapters, an attempt was made to describe the overall residential patterns in New Orleans. Given that one has had some success in describing and pointing out the implications of the residential patterns in the city, the question of how these patterns are formed and maintained is still left unanswered. A study which is solely demographic or ecological is very limited in elucidating this question, since many non-demographic and non-ecological factors enter into the picture. The socio-cultural and social psychological factors are unattainable in this type of study. Only those variables which were available from census reports, were employed. The role migration played in forming and maintaining present residential patterns was the objective of this chapter. An attempt was made to substantiate hypothesis 6 (Residential segregation is quantitatively higher in areas which have the most stable populations).

I. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

Types of migration. Three types of internal migration can be identified as playing important roles in
maintaining residential patterns: (1) out-migration, (2) in-migration, and (3) intra-city migration. Out-migration is that movement observed when individuals move out of one designated area to a different designated area. In-migration is that movement observed when individuals move into a designated area from some former area. Intra-city migration is movement within a given city. Most demographers have concentrated on in-migration, out-migration, and net migration. Only rarely have researchers dealt with intra-city migration. Sullenger's Omaha study pays particular attention to this mode of movement.

In analyzing these three types of population movements, three important aspects was the focus of attention. They were: (1) the characteristics of the migrants, i.e., race, income, education, occupation, (2) the direction of the movement, and (3) the characteristics of the areas involved in the movement. In short, the concern was mainly who was moving, where, and in what direction.

Migration and sociological theory. Geographical mobility is sociologically relevant because it is related to: (1) vertical mobility, (2) population size and composition, and (3) social organization. There is no need to

---

labor the well documented fact that movement from one class or stratum to another is frequently accompanied by a geographical mobility. Furthermore, it is a demographic fact that migration affects the size and composition of a population. For these reasons, no elaboration will be made of points one and two. Point three is pertinent to hypotheses 6; therefore, some mention of this point will follow.

Social organization is affected by geographical mobility because movement necessitates the breaking and forming of social relationships. In the process, migrants are relatively free from some of the expectations built into both sets of relationships. Focusing on area rather than individuals, it seems that a great deal of movement within any area will impede the stable structuring of social relationships. Placing particular attention on norms, it would seem reasonable that complete normative consensus in areas with large scale and constant population movements would be highly improbable. That is to say, population movements exert an unstabilizing effect on normative patterns. One such pattern in urban subareas would be a norm and

---


associated attitude about interracial residential areas. Specifically, the norm that makes Negroes undesirable inhabitants of white areas is referred to. How can complete consensus in this regard develop in a population with large scale turnover? If there is no complete consensus, one can expect the area to become racially mixed.

The above reasoning was the foundation for hypothesis 6, which states that residential segregation is higher in areas with the most stable populations. Unfortunately, the hypothesis should have been qualified. In fact, as it stands, it is far too general to test. The results revealed that migration or geographical mobility is far more complex than the above reasoning and hypothesis would indicate. What kind of movement should one take into consideration? Clearly the intent of the hypothesis was all three types listed above. However, total movement did not aid in predicting segregated areas from unsegregated areas.

II. TRACT DATA ON INTRA-CITY MIGRATION AND IN-MIGRATION

Total correlations. The total correlation between total migration and racial segregation was only .08. By total migration is meant the per cent of the individuals in a tract who have moved into their present residence from other residences in the city or from outside the city in or
after 1955. Total migration included intra-city migration plus in-migration. Since the United States Census did not record out-migration by census tracts, this type of movement was not included under the category of total movement.

Correlating in-migration and intra-city migration with residential segregation, revealed some differences. The correlation coefficient between in-migration and the residential segregation score was -.13. The correlation between intra-city migration (the per cent of the individuals presently residing in a tract who were residing in different residences in the city in or after 1955) and residential segregation was .18. The coefficients are still not very high. However, correlating these movements with per cent Negro yielded higher coefficients, as is shown in these results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation coefficient when correlated with per cent Negro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-city migration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These coefficients are not large but they are significant. Furthermore, the three socioeconomic status scores

---


6Ibid.
were all positively correlated with in-migration, as is shown in these results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlation coefficients when correlated with per cent in-migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational prestige</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the three socioeconomic status scores were negatively correlated with intra-city migration, as is shown in these results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlation coefficients when correlated with per cent intra-city migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational prestige</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partial correlations. These results suggest that (1) the in-migrants were settling in predominately white tracts with high socioeconomic status scores, and (2) the intra-city migrants were settling in Negro or "mixed" tracts with much lower socioeconomic status scores. The partial correlation coefficients affirmed these conclusions. Controlling for per cent Negro, the partial correlation coefficient between in-migration and education was .51, and .43 between in-migration and occupation. Interestingly enough, the partial correlations between the three socioeconomic status scores and intra-city migration, controlling for per
cent Negro, all but disappeared, as is shown in these results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partial correlation coefficients when correlated with per cent intra-city migration and controlling for per cent Negro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational prestige</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The indication is that most of this movement took place in Negro and "mixed" tracts, irrespective of the socioeconomic characteristics of these tracts. In short, race was a more important factor in explaining intra-city migration than was socioeconomic status.

**Corroborative data.** The assertion that intra-city migration was characteristic of Negro and "mixed" tracts can be further supported. Proportionately, more Negro and "mixed" tracts had high intra-city migration rates than did the white tracts, as shown by these results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per cent of tracts with high intra-city migration (38% or more)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negro tracts</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mixed&quot; tracts</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White tracts</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high rate for "mixed" tracts and the low rate for white tracts was predicted by hypothesis 6. The high rate of intra-city migration in Negro tracts was unanticipated.
The preliminary implications are that in-migration and intra-city migration helped maintain present residential patterns. In-migration was characteristic of white homogeneous, high socioeconomic status tracts. Intra-city migration was characteristic of Negro and "mixed" heterogeneous tracts.

An attempt was made to show that area characteristics coincided with characteristics of migrants. Data on migrants was gathered (1) to show the congruence between area characteristics and migrant characteristics, and (2) to compare the in-migrants, out-migrants, intra-city migrants, and the non-migrants. Table VIII on page 76 illustrates that Negroes were under represented as in-migrants and out-migrants, and over represented as intra-city migrants. Both the in-migrants and the out-migrants had higher socioeconomic statuses than did the intra-city migrants.

III. THE DATA ON THE IN-MIGRANTS AND INTRA-CITY MIGRANTS

The in-migrants. The census data on in-migrants revealed that 82 per cent of the in-migrants were white.\textsuperscript{7} Sixty-seven per cent of the white in-migrants had a high school education or better, as opposed to only 15 per cent

TABLE VIII
RACIAL AND SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS
OF MIGRANTS AND NON-MIGRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACIAL AND SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>Non-migrants</th>
<th>Intra-city migrants</th>
<th>In-migrants</th>
<th>Out-migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Negroes</td>
<td>99,724</td>
<td>86,060</td>
<td>8,598</td>
<td>14,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Negro</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of whites</td>
<td>180,054</td>
<td>122,513</td>
<td>40,303</td>
<td>66,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% white</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% individuals with 12 or more years of schooling</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Professional, technical, and Kindred workers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean family income</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$5,700</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data Unavailable
of the Negro in-migrants. Twenty-eight per cent of the white employed male in-migrants were classified as professionals, technicians, and kindred workers. Whereas, only 5 per cent of the in-migrants that were employed Negro males were found in this occupational strata. The mean family income for all in-migrants was $6,400, a figure higher than the $5,900 recorded for the entire city.

In short, these in-migrants were predominately white, well educated, with high occupational prestige, and a better than average family income. The in-migrants settled in tracts that were inhabited by individuals very much like themselves. The end result being that these residential areas remain predominately white, very homogeneous with high socioeconomic statuses. In other words, this population movement was very selective and helped maintain the residential pattern of these tracts.

The intra-city migrants. Although over two hundred thousand people have moved from one residence in the city to another since 1955, this did not upset the residential patterns appreciably. Since this intra-city migration was also selective, patterns were by and large maintained. This is not to rule out that changes do occur, on the contrary, over long periods of time drastic changes do occur in residential patterns, as testified by the findings of many ecologists. Taeuber and Taeuber gave ample substantiation of
this fact in their recent work. Since the writer has not analyzed the 1940 and 1950 censuses, such changes that may have occurred must be left to future research.

Of the 209,173 people who have changed residence since 1955, 59 per cent were white and 41 per cent were Negro. When this was normed on the basis of individual totals for the city, it was found that 43 per cent of the city's Negroes and 34 per cent of the city's whites moved. The Negroes were over represented. Forty-two per cent of the whites who were 25 and over had 12 or more years of school completed. Only 15 per cent of the Negroes in this category had 12 or more years completed. Approximately 12 per cent of the white employed males held professional and technical jobs. Only 3 per cent of the Negro intra-city migrants in this category were found in this occupational strata. The mean family income of the intra-city migrants was $5,700. In summary, the Negroes were over represented as intra-city migrants. These migrants were heterogeneous with respect to race and socioeconomic characteristics. The intra-city migrants were strikingly similar to the individuals residing in the areas in which they have moved. The net result being that the Negro and "mixed" areas were

---

heterogeneous with respect to income, occupation, and education. Intra-city migration helped maintain this pattern. The intra-city migrants and in-migrants compared. If one focuses on the difference between the intra-city migrants and the in-migrants, the above point will be better illustrated. Of the in-migrants, 82 per cent were white. Only 59 per cent of the intra-city migrants were white. Thirty-two per cent of the intra-city migrants who were 25 years and older had completed 12 or more years of formal schooling. In contrast, 61 per cent of the in-migrants in this category had completed 12 or more years of formal schooling. Of the intra-city migrants who were employed males, only 9 per cent had professional or technical occupations. In contrast, 24 per cent of the in-migrants did. The mean family income of the intra-city migrants was $5,700, that of the in-migrants was $6,400. The in-migrants moved into predominately white, high socioeconomic status areas that were homogeneous with respect to income, education, and occupation. The intra-city migrants moved into Negro or "mixed" areas that were heterogeneous with respect to these status scores, which ran the gambit from high to low socioeconomic status. Thus, both movements ran parallel to the existing residential patterns.

It was suspected that the positive correlation coefficient between per cent Negro and per cent intra-city
migrants on the one hand, and the negative correlation coefficient between per cent Negro and per cent in-migration on the other, was due to the fact that Negro areas had more renters, so this variable was controlled. It was found that the partial coefficient between per cent Negro and per cent intra-city migrants dropped only from .35 to .31. In other words, the fact that Negro areas contained more renter occupied dwellings, did not explain why Negroes were over represented as intra-city migrants. Economic factors alone did not explain the correlation between per cent Negro and per cent intra-city migrants. The conclusion drawn is that intra-city migration, which is characteristic of Negro and "mixed" areas, helped maintain the socioeconomic status heterogeneity of these areas.

IV. THE OUT-MIGRANTS

Granted that one understands partially the part these two kinds of population movements (intra-city migration and in-migration) played in maintaining residential patterns, a consideration of out-migration still remains. Of the 80,455 out-migrants, 82 per cent were white. U.S. Bureau of the Census. Mobility For Metropolitan Areas, Op. Cit., p.320.
managerial occupations. The mean family income of the out-migrants was $6,600. In short, the out-migrants and the in-migrants were strikingly similar. The in-migrants and the out-migrants were very similar, and both types of migrants stood in striking contrast to the intra-city migrants, as Table XIII illustrates.

In summary, it should be kept in mind that this analysis of migration does not proport to be a longitudinal one. There was no attempt to analyze residential patterns according to the invasion-succession model of residential change.¹⁰ No doubt all three kinds of migration did exert changes of some kind. In order to observe these changes, residential patterns must be studied at two points in time. Clearly, this was not the objective of this research study. It is maintained, however, that these population movements sustained present residential patterns. That is, the kind of movement was related to the kind of residential pattern. Intra-city migration was correlated with Negro or "mixed" areas that were heterogeneous. In-migration was correlated with the predominately white areas, which were homogeneous with respect to socioeconomic statuses. Since tract data were not available for out-migration, no comparable categorization was possible. One may infer however, that the

out-migrants were from the predominately white homogeneous tracts.

The major point is simply that migration and residential patterns were related. Migrants were selective, either by choice or chance, in their movements.

The implication of these findings point to a relationship between intra-city migration and residential norms. If Negro and "mixed" areas had more intra-city migrants, then some consideration should be given to the relationship between norms that govern residential racial mixing and intra-city migration. The possibility of this relationship being something more than spurious is worthy of investigation. If it can be shown that such a relationship exists, then theoretical notions that connect geographical mobility and social control will stand on firmer ground.
Of the six hypotheses investigated, four were supported by the data. Hypothesis 1 (The predominately Negro areas of the city are those categorized by high unemployment rates and low socioeconomic statuses.), hypothesis 2 (The predominately white areas are those categorized by high socioeconomic statuses and low unemployment rates.), hypothesis 4 (The foreign stock, mainly Italian stock, are as residentially segregated from Negroes as are the native whites.), and hypothesis 5 (The foreign stock reside in residential areas categorized by socioeconomic statuses not much different from the native white population.) were all supported by the data. Hypothesis 3 (Residential segregation is quantitatively higher in the areas which are the most homogeneous with respect to income, occupation, and education.) and hypothesis 6 (Residential segregation is quantitatively higher in areas which have the most stable populations.) in general, were not supported by the data.

I. HYPOTHESES 1 AND 2

The conclusions drawn from the data presented in Chapter II were: (1) Negro areas were the low socioeconomic status areas with higher unemployment rates, a younger
population, and more renters than the white areas; (2) the white areas were the high socioeconomic status areas; and (3) the "mixed" areas were somewhere in between these two extremes.

In summary, hypotheses 1 and 2 were supported by the data. The data on census tracts for the 1960 Census of New Orleans revealed that the socioeconomic conditions of Negroes in 1960 were substantially the same as those recorded by Hillery based on the 1950 Census report.¹

II. HYPOTHESES 4 AND 5

The conclusions drawn from the data presented in Chapter IV were: (1) the foreign stock (mainly Italian stock) were as residentially segregated from the Negroes as were the native whites; (2) the foreign stock (mainly Italian stock) were not segregated from the native whites appreciably; and (3) the foreign stock (mainly Italian stock) were located in areas with socioeconomic statuses not much different from the native whites.

In summary, the results revealed that hypotheses 4 and 5 were supported. It was concluded that extensive patterns of prejudice and discrimination directed at the

foreign stock were inconsistent with the data. These results could not be compared to other studies on ethnic segregation. Most studies used the category foreign born; whereas, the present study employed the term foreign stock (foreign born plus the children of foreign or mixed parentage).

A brief historical account of the residential distribution of the foreign born revealed that originally the immigrants were concentrated in certain areas and were socially and economically deprived compared to native white standards. Compared to their forebears, the foreign stock were in a more desirable position socially and economically. The conclusion was reached that the data on the foreign stock was consistent with an assimilated population.

III. HYPOTHESIS 3

The data presented in Chapter III led to the following conclusions: (1) the Negro areas were heterogeneous with respect to income, occupation, and education; (2) the white areas were homogeneous with respect to income, occupation, and education; and (3) the "mixed" areas were intermediate between the Negro and the white areas.

These results indicate that there was more socioeconomic status segregation in white areas than in Negro areas. The implication is that socioeconomic status stratification
is the necessary, but not the sufficient condition for class stratification.

Clearly, hypothesis 3 was not supported by the data. The anticipation was that both Negro and white areas would be more homogeneous than the "mixed" areas. The results revealed that Negro areas were heterogeneous. Since patterns of prejudice and discrimination limit Negro occupancy to certain areas in most American cities, Negroes with high and low socioeconomic statuses are constrained to live side by side. This statement is offered as a testable hypothesis; it is not meant to be a foregone conclusion.

In addition, the heterogeneity measures might be useful to compare the socioeconomic status segregation between cities. It would be interesting to know whether northern or southern cities have more socioeconomic status segregation.

IV. HYPOTHESIS 6

The data presented in Chapter V led to the following conclusions: (1) the in-migrants were predominately white with high socioeconomic statuses; (2) the in-migrants moved to predominately white areas in the city with high socioeconomic statuses; (3) the out-migrants were predominately white with high socioeconomic statuses; (4) the Negroes were over represented as intra-city migrants; (5) the intra-city migrants had lower socioeconomic statuses than the
in-migrants and the out-migrants.

The results indicate that migration was highly selective. The characteristics of the migrants, whether in-migrants or intra-city migrants, were similar to the characteristics of the areas into which they moved. Predominately white areas were characterized by in-migration and presumably, out-migration. The predominately Negro and "mixed" areas were characterized by intra-city migration. Negro and "mixed" areas had considerable population turnover. It would seem that migration and residential segregation were related, but not in the way hypothesized. In general form, hypothesis 6 was not substantiated. The data did reveal that intra-city migration was characteristic of non-segregated areas ("mixed"). This was predicted by hypothesis 6. The fact that intra-city migration was also characteristic of Negro areas was unanticipated. Hypothesis 6 was only partially supported. It would seem that intra-city migration may influence norms governing residential mixing. This is not offered as a foregone conclusion, but as a testable hypothesis.

V. IMPLICATIONS

The main working assumption of this study was that "place" has a geographical and a social dimension. If this were not the case, residential segregation would be an
unexplainable phenomenon. The low prestige attached to the status Negro, is also attached to the area where Negros reside. People and "place" become synonymous. Insiders and outsiders evaluate an area. This evaluation is a product of an economic and a social assessment. Economic, because cost of residence and its location to facilities (schools, churches, and recreational centers) is considered. Social, because the kind of inhabitants is considered as well as a social evaluation of the area.

Economic factors alone did not explain racial segregation in New Orleans. Nor do they explain the persistence of such areas as the "Garden District" and the "Irish Channel". It is not claimed that the areas studied represent "natural areas". The contention is that areas are differentially valued.

It is important to note that homogeneity (either by race, socioeconomic status or ethnicity) is a necessary condition for the development of "natural areas". If this condition (homogeneity) is not met, it is difficult to picture residents with strong positive sentiments toward each other and toward their area of residence. Furthermore, it is difficult to picture "natural areas" developing in areas where there is a large scale population turnover. For this reason, special attention was paid to racial composition, socioeconomic status heterogeneity, and migration. In
short, the inference that residential distance is partially congruent with social distance, can only be true if evaluations of people and areas are intervening variables in a person's choice of a residence.
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APPENDIX

Before presenting a methodological treatment of the research procedures followed in this study, a brief comment on the variables employed is necessary.

The variables were derived from the U. S. Census report for New Orleans.¹ The census tract data were used rather than block data because the tract data contained social, economic, and housing characteristics; whereas, the block data were almost exclusively housing characteristics.

I. THE COMPUTATION OF VARIABLES

Variables measured as a per cent of tract total. In general, the population characteristics for census tracts were taken from an approximately twenty-five per cent sample.² Housing characteristics were derived from either a five, twenty, or twenty-five per cent sample. In most cases, the variables were calculated on the basis of the tract population. For example, the number of Negroes in a given tract divided by the tract total and expressed as a per cent was the manner of calculating per cent Negro. Wherever


²Ibid., p.8.
possible this procedure was followed.

The age variables were very difficult to calculate using the intervals designated, because the census reports used eighteen intervals and broke down the age of the population by sex. These intervals had to be combined to conform to the three age intervals employed in this research study. This meant the eighteen intervals had to be collapsed and the sex categories combined. This very laborious work was facilitated by use of the electrical calculator.

**Segregation scores.** The segregation scores represented variables that were adapted from Jahn's segregation score. The formula for this segregation score turns out to be: 

\[ S = \frac{O - E}{T} \]

Where \( S \) stands for the segregation score, \( O \) refers to the observed number of some subpopulation, \( E \) stands for the expected number based on the city total and \( T \) stands for the total population of a given tract. The expected number can be ascertained by taking the proportion of the city's total of some subpopulation and multiplying that figure by the tract total. The score may assume either a positive or negative value, and may range from \( X \) to \( X-100 \), where \( X \) equals the per cent subpopulation of the total city population. The sign was retained for the segregation score

---

of the Italian stock and the total foreign stock. The sign was discarded for the segregation score of Negroes.

A more efficient way of calculating the score was used. It can be seen, from inspecting Jahn's formula, that the computation involves one subtraction, one multiplication and one division. If one subtracts the per cent of a sub-population for the entire city by its per cent of a tract, two operations can be eliminated. Since the census reports contain these two percentages for Negroes, the overall operation is simplified. The per cent Italian stock of a tract was not reported, so this had to be computed separately.

The above segregation scores were employed because tract measures were needed for correlational analysis. Most indices of segregation give a general measure for the entire city. It will be recalled that a consideration of the dissimilarity index was presented in Chapter III, along with a consideration of the heterogeneity measures. These two types of measures were compared.

Occupational prestige score. The socioeconomic status measure referred to as the mean of occupational prestige score and the heterogeneity measure of these scores

---

need some clarification. The occupational prestige score was based on ranking the census report's list of occupational categories, according to the North and Hatt occupational ratings. Only the employed males were used. The United States Census reports nine different categories of occupations. Table IX on page 100 illustrates the different categories and the occupational prestige score assigned to each. The numbers chosen for the prestige scores were one digit numbers. Since only the overall ranking of the occupational categories was important, the size of the numbers used was quite arbitrary. One digit numbers were used since means and standard deviations were computed from these distributions. The choice of the smaller numbers made computations more simple. The mean of these scores for each tract was computed; and this mean was the recorded occupational prestige score. The mean was calculated by summing the products of the number of males in each specific occupational category and the prestige score of that category and then dividing this sum by the total employed males.

Occupational heterogeneity score. The occupational heterogeneity score for a tract was computed by dividing the


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY</th>
<th>OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, Officials and Proprietors, including farm</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and Kindred Workers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen, Foreman, and Kindred Workers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives and Kindred Workers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Household Workers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers, except Private Household Workers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers, except mine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
standard deviation of this distribution by the mean of the same distribution. These two variables were the only ordinal scale variables employed in this study.

II. CORRELATION ANALYSIS

The main statistical technique used in this research project was, as already mentioned, correlational analysis. A more mathematical treatment of the uses and limitations of correlational analysis will presently follow.

The total correlation coefficient. The variables employed were coded and punched on I.B.M. cards. A correlation matrix was generated. Part of this matrix is presented in Table X on page 102. The table illustrates the strength of the relationships and their directions. These correlations represent total correlations. Total correlation is that correlation between two variables with no attempt being made to control for other variables. The relationship can be specified by the formula for the straight line.

Allowing Y to be any dependent variable and X to be any independent variable, a linear relationship between the two variables may be described as \( Y = a + bX \). The slope of the line, symbolized here by "b", indicates how many unit changes in Y follows one unit change in X. The Y intercept, symbolized as "a", represents the point at which the line
### TABLE X

**CORRELATION MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>+.25</td>
<td>- .31</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>+.06</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>+.32</td>
<td>+.31</td>
<td>+.78</td>
<td>+.78</td>
<td>+.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>+.02</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>+.17</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>+.27</td>
<td>+.12</td>
<td>+.39</td>
<td>+.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>+.61</td>
<td>+.19</td>
<td>+.27</td>
<td>+.33</td>
<td>+.15</td>
<td>+.35</td>
<td>+.57</td>
<td>+.16</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>+.09</td>
<td>+.21</td>
<td>+.28</td>
<td>+.69</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>+.41</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>+.01</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.14</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>+.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>+.15</td>
<td>+.11</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.70</td>
<td>+.85</td>
<td>+.27</td>
<td>+.47</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.93</td>
<td>+.21</td>
<td>+.59</td>
<td>+.61</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.39</td>
<td>+.71</td>
<td>+.54</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.93</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.76</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.25</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>+.09</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>+.29</td>
<td>+.21</td>
<td>+.11</td>
<td>+.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.46</td>
<td>+.38</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>+.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.90</td>
<td>+.30</td>
<td>+.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.24</td>
<td>+.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1-per cent male unemployed
2-per cent 0-19 years
3-per cent 20-64 years
4-per cent 65+ years
5-per cent male
6-median family income
7-median school years completed
8-occupational prestige
9-segregation score for Italian stock

10-segregation score for foreign stock
11-per cent in-migration
12-per cent intra-city migration
13-income heterogeneity
14-occupational heterogeneity
15-educational heterogeneity
16-population size of tract
17-per cent Negro
cuts the Y axis when X equals 0. An analysis of slopes and Y intercepts were not considered in this research; only the magnitude of the correlation and its direction were.

The Pearson correlation coefficient \( r \) was used in this study. The computations for this coefficient can be found in any general statistics text.\(^7\) Its range is from 1.0 to -1.0. The coefficient is a measure of the goodness of fit of the least-squares straight line.\(^8\) That is, if every \( x \) score varies away from the mean of the \( X \) scores in the same direction and the same magnitude (variation times slope) as the corresponding \( y \) score varies from its mean, then \( X \) and \( Y \) are positively correlated; and the relationship is "perfect". In such case, the correlation coefficient is 1.0. If they vary by the same amount in the opposite direction, the correlation coefficient is -1.0. This however, is rarely the case. The \( X \) and \( Y \) points, rarely fall exactly on the line. Usually, the correlations are far from perfect. The coefficient is a measure of how close a prediction of \( Y \), one can make by knowing \( X \) and the slope of the line.

Unfortunately, the coefficient cannot be interpreted directly. The square of the coefficient is more useful when a direct interpretation is desired. The measure \( r^2 \) can be


\[^8\text{Ibid., p. 286.}\]
interpreted as the proportion of the total variation in the one variable statistically "explained" by the other. This is not the only interpretation of \( r \) and \( r^2 \), but it was the one followed in this study. Stouffer lists seven different interpretations without exhausting the list.

Although \( X \) stands for the independent variable and \( Y \) stands for the dependent variable, no statistics can demonstrate causality. The use of \( Y \) and \( X \) as dependent and independent variable respectively, is a statistical convention. The variables used in this study can be used both as \( X \)'s or \( Y \)'s depending on one's strategy. Only when the time sequence of the variables is known, does this division between independent and dependent variables becomes anything more than a convention.

The partial correlation coefficient. When one, two, or more variables are used to elaborate the analysis, it is frequently useful to control for these variables. That is, the original relationship between \( X \) and \( Y \) may change when one or more additional variables are held constant. Actually the added variable or variables are not held constant. Instead, values of the dependent and independent

\[ \text{Ibid., p.298.} \]

variables are "adjusted" in order to take into consideration the scores of the control variable.\textsuperscript{11}

The partial correlation gives a single measure that summerizes the degree of relationship between two variables, controlling for one or more other variables.\textsuperscript{12} Partial correlational analysis can be used to show that a relationship holds even after certain variables are controlled. In this study, the positive correlation between per cent Negro and per cent intra-city migration remained even after controlling for per cent housing units that were renter occupied. If the original relationship disappears after controlling for one or more variables, the researcher might want to investigate the possibility that the original relationship was spurious. Theoretically, there is no limit to the number of control variables that can be introduced. At some point a decision must be reached. That decision should be prompted by both theoretical considerations and parsimony.

\textbf{The multiple regression}. Total correlations and partial correlations only give a measure of the relationship between two variables at a time. If one's strategy involves predicting a value of the dependent variable on the knowledge of several independent variables, then the multiple

\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Ibid.,} p.332.
regression is useful. The multiple regression $R^2$ can handle two or more independent variables and thus does not limit the researcher to one independent variable. In this case, one is not interested in the correlation coefficient but its square. The $R^2$ is a measure of the "explained" variation in some dependent variable. Although predictive equations as such, were not used in this research study, the regression model was found useful. If it is desired to know the combined explanatory value of several X's on some Y, then the regression model is very useful.

It will be recalled that seventy-one per cent of the variation in per cent Negro from tract to tract was statistically explained by income, occupation, and education measures. Furthermore, seventy-five per cent of the variation in per cent Negro was explained by the three heterogeneity measures. Although the computations were difficult, the interpretation is rather straightforward. The first independent variable is allowed to explain all the variation in the dependent variable. The second independent variable is then allowed to explain variation in the dependent variable, controlling for the first independent variable and so on. Thus, each contribution to the explanation of the variation in the dependent variable is summed. After the first variable, the additional variables are allowed only to operate on the still unexplained variation in the dependent variable.
All previously used variables are controlled when a new variable is allowed to operate.\textsuperscript{13}

The multiple-partial correlation coefficient. If one's strategy is to ascertain how much variation in some dependent variable is explained by several independent variables, while other independent variables are controlled, then the multiple-partial correlation coefficient becomes useful.

In the present study, it was demonstrated that the three heterogeneity measures explained variation in per cent Negro even after income, occupation, and education were controlled. However, income, occupation, and education explained very little variation in per cent Negro when the three heterogeneity measures were controlled. Thus, the conclusion was drawn that the heterogeneity measures were better predictors of per cent Negro than the three socio-economic status measures.

The multiple-partial correlation coefficient is an extension and combination of the multiple regression coefficient.\textsuperscript{14} The multiple-partial correlation coefficient is computed by first computing a multiple regression coefficient for both control and test variables from which is

\textsuperscript{13}Ibid., p.347.
\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p.350.
subtracted the multiple regression coefficient of the control variables. This quantity is divided by the variation unexplained by the multiple regression coefficient of just the test variables. The multiple-partial coefficient is then a measure of the explained variation in some dependent variable that is not explained by the control variables.

III. ASSUMPTIONS OF CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS

When using correlation coefficients, two assumptions are made. First, the independent variables bear a linear relationship to the dependent variable. The second assumption is that the variables are additive. That is, each independent variable acts independently in explaining variation in the dependent variable. This second assumption only applies to multiple regression coefficients and multiple-partial coefficients. Since this research study involves an extensive use of correlational analysis, each assumption will be considered in some detail.

Linearity. When the correlation between two variables is non-linear, a line on a graph representing it is parabolic. That is, the line that depicts the relationship on a graph is bent. If this is the case, an equation for a parabola will better describe the relationship between the two variables. By using such an equation, more variation can be explained. Since the mathematics becomes more
difficult, the most simple approach would be to plot the two variables on regular graph paper. By visual inspection, one can observe whether the line bends or not. If the relationship is non-linear, plotting on semi-log graph paper will convert the line to linear form. An alternative method of presentation is to plot the log of X against Y.

In this research study, it was suspected that the segregation score of Negroes bore a non-linear relationship between many independent variables and for this reason percent Negro was used in its stead. Figure 4 on page 110 represents the non-linear relationship between this variable and occupational heterogeneity.

The graphing of variables becomes very tedious when the number of cases employed is very large. Statistical tests are available that test for non-linearity, but the computations involved are also tedious.\textsuperscript{15} Since both methods are rather laborious, the method that reveals the most information is preferable. Since graphing relationships, not only tells the researcher whether they are non-linear or not, but also gives their form; this method is preferred by the writer.

Additivity. The second major assumption that will be analyzed, is the property of additivity. By additivity is

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 316.
THE NON-LINEAR RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RACIAL SEGREGATION SCORE AND THE OCCUPATIONAL HETEROGENEITY SCORE
meant that each independent variable acts independently. That is, the effect of X and Z, taken together, on Y is the same as the sum of the effects of X and Z on Y taken individually.

For example, in the present study it was demonstrated that educational heterogeneity and median school years completed were strongly correlated with per cent Negro. The multiple regression model incorporating these measures revealed that seventy-six per cent of the variation in per cent Negro could be accounted for by these measures. Do these measures taken individually explain less variation in per cent Negro than when taken jointly? Do they interact? If the answer is yes, then it is the unique union of the two variables that is doing the explaining.

Fortunately, there are rather simple tests that have been recently developed which can answer these questions. Recently, Goodman has proposed three alternative tests to test for interaction. Only one of these tests will be presented here. The test referred to as the $X^2$ was used to test for interaction between educational heterogeneity and median school years completed. Table XI on page 112

---

Ibid., p.257.

TABLE XI

A THREE FACTOR CONTINGENCY TABLE DEPICTING
THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN EDUCATION,
EDUCATIONAL HETEROGENEITY AND
PER CENT NEGRO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>HIGH EDUCATIONAL HETEROGENEITY</th>
<th>LOW EDUCATIONAL HETEROGENEITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-100% Negro</td>
<td>0-19% Negro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
illustrates the relationships between these variables and per cent Negro. In order to accommodate these variables in a contingency table, they had to be dichotomized. An examination of the frequencies in the eight cells revealed that the cell frequencies under high educational heterogeneity are not different from those under the low heterogeneity column. Of course, the two sets of diagonal frequencies $57-1$ and $6-45$ reflect the fact that most Negro and "mixed" tracts had high educational heterogeneity scores and were below the median for school years completed.

If the two variables, educational heterogeneity and median school years completed interact with each other, the ratio of the products formed by the cell frequencies diagonal to each other i.e. $\frac{57 \times 1}{5 \times 6}$ under the column of high educational heterogeneity would have an absolute value very different from the ratio formed by the cell frequencies under the column of low educational heterogeneity i.e. $\frac{6 \times 15}{11 \times 18}$. In non-mathematical terms, this simple means that Negro and "mixed" tracts have high educational heterogeneity scores whether the tracts are above or below the median for school years completed. Similarly, the predominately white tracts have low educational heterogeneity scores whether they are above or below the median for school years completed. The square of the difference between the two ratios reflects the interaction between the two variables. The
magnitude of this figure reflects not only the amount of interaction between the two variables but their variances as well. For this reason, the figure obtained after squaring must be divided by the sum of the estimated variances of the two variables being tested. No attempt will be made here to present the procedure for estimating the respective variances. The reader is referred to the article by Goodman, which is illustrated with examples.  

A chi-square table for one degree of freedom is used to test the significance of $X^2$. If $X^2$ is not significant at the level chosen, then the researcher concludes no interaction exists between the two variables. The columns, rows, and layers of the contingency table can be rearranged to test for interaction between any combination of variables.

Tests for interaction were made between socioeconomic status scores and heterogeneity scores and between migration variables and socioeconomic status scores. In no case was interaction demonstrated. These results increased the confidence one has placed in the appropriateness of the multiple regression and multiple-partial correlation coefficient models.

The significance of correlation coefficients. One final technique remains to be clarified. No mention has

---

18 Ibid., p.323-324.
been made of the statistical significance of the correlational coefficients. Depending on the sample size, a correlation coefficient of .30 may or may not be significant. Clearly, it makes little sense to use a coefficient in the analysis of data that could have likely been the result of chance. For this reason, only the significant coefficients were used. The significance level chosen here was the .001 level. Most coefficients used in this study had much lower probabilities associated with them.

Significance tests for correlational coefficients involve the ratio between explained and unexplained variance. As already stated, the square of the correlation coefficient can be interpreted as the explained variation. That is to say, this is a statistical explanation; which merely means that a certain proportion of the variation in some dependent variable can be explained by the variation in some independent variable.

If one interprets $r^2$ as explained variation, then clearly the unexplained variation is $1-r^2$. The ratio between the two ($\frac{r^2}{1-r^2}$) is referred to as the F ratio and is equivalent to the F ratio used in an analysis of variance table. The F ratio is associated with certain

---

20 Ibid., pp.251-252.
probabilities. There are separate distributions for each set of degrees of freedom. In general, the degrees of freedom for the F ratios are 1 and \( N-2 \).\(^{21}\) Table XII on page 117 includes the F ratios and their associated probabilities for a selected number of correlation coefficients used in this study.

\(^{21}\text{Ibid., p.304.}\)
TABLE XII

THE F-RATIOS AND THEIR ASSOCIATED PROBABILITIES
FOR SELECTED CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>PROBABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-%N</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>99.38</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-%N</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>99.38</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-%N</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>265.22</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.H.-%N</td>
<td>+.29</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.H.-%N</td>
<td>+.71</td>
<td>151.98</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.H.-%N</td>
<td>+.84</td>
<td>266.71</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-S.F.S.</td>
<td>+.52</td>
<td>55.13</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-S.F.S.</td>
<td>+.59</td>
<td>78.97</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-S.F.S.</td>
<td>+.71</td>
<td>151.98</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-%I.C.M.</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-%I.C.M.</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-%I.C.M.</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>28.31</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-%I.M.</td>
<td>+.47</td>
<td>41.72</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-%I.M.</td>
<td>+.61</td>
<td>87.91</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-%I.M.</td>
<td>+.54</td>
<td>61.09</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**N=per cent Negro
I=income
E=education
O=occupational prestige
I.H.=income heterogeneity
E.H.=educational heterogeneity
O.H.=occupational heterogeneity
S.F.S.=segregation of foreign stock
I.C.M.=intra-city migrants
I.M.=in-migrants
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