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Abstract

Popular narratives of African-American outmigration from the city tell a story of “melting-pot suburbs” and the end of segregation. However, these narratives rely on declines in the White population proportion across suburbs and declines in absolute levels of segregation across metropolitan regions. This paper uses segregation indices, ArcGIS spatial analysis, and descriptive statistics at the municipal level to examine the relationship between increased African-American suburbanization and levels of segregation in the Chicago MSA. African-Americans are leaving Chicago and entering the suburbs and the level of metropolitan segregation in the region has been steadily declining since the 1970s. However, analysis reveals that re-segregation rather than integration is occurring in Chicago’s suburbs; that African-Americans remain uniquely segregated in the Chicago MSA; that the rate of segregation is declining at a faster pace in the City than in the suburbs; and that the suburbs are now a greater contributor to metropolitan segregation than the City. As the suburbs become the new terrain for residential segregation, theory must re-examine why African-American entrance into the suburbs has not fit a spatial assimilation model.
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INTRODUCTION

It has been nearly two decades since Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton argued for the return of the word segregation to the vernacular of racial inequality\(^1\). Residential segregation concentrates poverty, affects how community residents interact with each other, and limits access to jobs and education. These same decades have been subject to a dramatic increase in Black outmigration from the central city. This thesis engages the discourse on segregation in the context of increased African-American suburbanization. Chicago, with a history of hyper-segregation and an acute rise in Black suburbanization, serves as the case study.

Previous research on racial integration generally supports a spatial assimilation model (Massey 1985) where the suburbs offer a better opportunity for integration than the central city and minority access to the suburbs indicates a larger process of spatial assimilation (Rosenbaum 1995; Alba et al. 1999; Clark 2006, 2009; Fischer 2008; Hall & Lee 2010; Sandoval 2011). However, African-Americans have generally been seen as an exception to this model (Massey 1985; Alba & Logan 1993; Denton & Massey 1988; Farley 1990; Freeman 2000). Increased African-American suburbanization offers a unique opportunity to examine whether the nature and magnitude of Black segregation in the suburbs differs from that of the central city. This paper asks the question: is recent African-American outmigration from the City of Chicago leading to residential integration in the MSA?

Between 2000 and 2010 the population in the City of Chicago declined by over 200,000 people; nearly 90 percent of this net population loss was African-American (2010 Census data). Popular explanations for African-American outmigration tell a story of upward mobility and increased suburban diversity (e.g. Glaeser and Vigdor 2012).\(^2\) However, these narratives rely on declines in the White popula-


\(^2\) For example, a recent New York Times article, Segregation Curtailed in U.S. Cities, Study finds, notes that “the suburbanization of Blacks was instrumental” in decreasing metropolitan segregation. For the full article see Roberts, January 30, 2012.
tion proportion across suburbs and declines in absolute levels of segregation across metropolitan regions.

This thesis deploys a more nuanced methodology to examine the relationship between increased African-American suburbanization and levels of African-American segregation in Chicago. First, it calculates the standard Dissimilarity (D) and Isolation (I) Indices of Segregation for the metropolitan region. Second, it calculates the Dissimilarity Index for the City and the suburbs separately in order to illustrate the differences in segregation between these two geographies over time. Third, it uses the decomposition property of the Thiel Entropy (H) Index to reveal how much the City and the suburbs each contribute to metropolitan segregation. Fourth, it supplements indices of segregation with ArcGIS spatial analysis to examine where Africans Americans in the region are living, moving, and concentrated over time. Finally, it uses descriptive statistics at the municipal level to examine residential segregation within boundaries of political and social significance.

African-Americans are leaving Chicago and entering the suburbs and the level of metropolitan segregation has been steadily declining since the 1970s. However, analysis reveals that racial re-segregation rather than integration is occurring in Chicago's suburbs; that African-Americans, regardless of household wealth, remain uniquely segregated in the MSA; that the rate of segregation is declining at a faster pace in the City than in the suburbs; and that the suburbs are now a greater contributor to metropolitan segregation than the City. African-American suburbanization in the region remains an exception to a spatial assimilation model. The place stratification model (Logan 1978) and the residential preference model (Schelling 1971) better explain African-American suburban residential patterns in the region.

As the suburbs become the new terrain for residential segregation, theory must examine why African-American entrance into the suburbs has not led to spatial assimilation. In conclusion, I put forth four political economy frameworks to explain “the suburbanization of African-American segregation” in order to initiate a discussion on how planning and policy officials can better achieve levels of regional residential integration.
Chapter 1  
BACKGROUND

Before Segregation

Prior to the First Great Migration (1910-1940), Chicago’s African-Americans were as integrated as other ethnic groups (Spear 1967). Over half the population lived on racially mixed blocks of the City’s South and West Sides. Many lived near work as servants for White families, some were families which had bought properties on the outskirts of the city that eventually were absorbed by its growth, while others were prosperous families following the affluent residential pattern away from the city center (Drake & Clayton 1962: 174).

African-Americans experienced sporadic resistance when moving into new neighborhoods. Drake and Clayton refer to Black settlement in this period as a “filtering process” where “when only a few Negroes were involved, and they were of equivalent social status to Whites… initial hostility gave way to tolerance or even friendliness” (1962:176). In 1910, there were roughly 40,000 African-Americans in the City of Chicago and another 5,000 in the suburbs. No more than a dozen blocks on the South Side of Chicago- the Black Belt- were entirely African-American (Spear 1967: 14-15).

The Great Migration and the Lack of Black Residential Mobility in Chicago

Not until the First Great Migration was resistance to Black residential choice institutionalized. Between 1915 and 1920, over 65,000 African-Americans migrated to Chicago. Overcrowding in the Black Belt led to the expansion of its borders. As Blacks moved into adjoining White neighborhoods they were met with threats, violence, and organized resistance. Between July 1917 and March 1921, 58 bombings of properties leased or purchased by Blacks in White neighborhoods were recorded (Anderson & Pickering 1986: 21). “Neighborhood improvement Associations” formed to pressure White owners and landlords to refuse property transactions with Blacks. The Chicago Real Estate Board (CREB), which organized these associations, confined sales of property to Blacks only in neighborhoods with pre-existing Black popula-
tions. The Supreme Court blocked racial zoning from becoming a city ordinance but the CREB organized “block clubs” in White neighborhoods that ensured that no homes were sold to Blacks. As Satter describes (2009: 40): “Chicago’s realtors were instrumental in the creation of a dual housing market both locally and nationally—that is, a “White” market of low prices and expansive neighborhood choices and a “Black” market of high prices and “extremely limited options.”

Racially restrictive covenants, private contracts limiting home sales or rentals to Blacks, Jews and Asians were also introduced to restrict Black mobility. By 1930, over three-fourths of all the residential property in Chicago was bound by restrictive covenants and could not be rented or sold to African-Americans (Drake & Clayton 1962: 184). As Spear (1967: 21) documents for this period, “Whites often succeeded in keeping Negroes out. When their efforts failed they gradually moved out.”

The Second Great Migration (1940-1970) was preceded by federal housing policies that further limited residential options for African-Americans and intensified racial segregation. In 1934 Congress created the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) which insured home mortgages granted by bank and loan institutions. Mortgage loans that once covered only 50 to 70 percent of a home price now covered 90 percent making it more affordable to purchase than rent a home. However, these mortgages were not extended to African-Americans households; the FHA embraced racist appraisal policies based on the assumption that race mixing would hurt property values. The FHA determined which neighborhoods would be denied mortgage insurance based on the existence or expected existence of African-Americans. Thus, even if White residents wanted to sell to Blacks, the federal government discouraged them. The presence of just one Black family meant that the FHA would mortgage redline an entire block or even neighborhood. This encouraged White resistance to Black neighbors as White families now had an economic incentive to keep Black families out (Satter 2009: 45). Even African-Americans who had lived in White neighborhoods before the Great Migration were forced back into Black neighborhoods. Satter (2009) illustrates how these FHA redlining policies made Blacks vulnerable to property selling scam artists. With severely limited housing options and no mortgage access, Black home purchasers were forced to buy housing “on contract;” they were severely overcharged for homes and if they missed a single payment installment their house could be repossessed.

3 While racial zoning was rejected, zoning was nonetheless used for social segregation. For a more in depth discussion, see Thomas (1994).
Other organizations were also effective in limiting Black residential mobility. The Metropolitan Housing and Planning Council created the Illinois Blighted Areas Redevelopment Act that established a new public agency, the Land Clearance Commission, with the authority to acquire “blighted” land and sell to private developers. Black residential neighborhoods were bulldozed and replaced with housing beyond the price range of the former tenants. Later, an attachment to the act allocated money to provide public housing for 15% of former residents. However, the City Council had veto power over public housing sites and blocked public housing in White neighborhoods. On the local level, The University of Chicago actively pursued policies to minimize African-American presence in the South Side neighborhood of Hyde Park. Lawrence Kimpton, the University Chancellor worked on legislation to extend powers of the Land Clearance Commission. A new clearance approach called “conservation” was developed. With this legislation, neighborhoods that were not “blighted” but in danger of becoming “blighted” were now razed by the authority (Satter 2009). These neighborhoods were primarily Black.

The Illinois Blighted Areas Redevelopment Act set the stage for federal urban renewal legislation, chiefly the Federal Housing Act of 1949. This provided federal financing for slum clearance (Title I), further increased authorization for FHA home insurance (Title II), and increased federal money for public housing units (Title III). Chicago and the nation now had federal money to continue displacing Black residents by demolition. The allocation of public housing money was inadequate, local authorities determined the location of housing, and Whites excluded public housing from their community.

The hundreds of thousands of African-Americans that arrived in The Great Migration had only two places they could easily live: The Black Belt or a small section of the West Side’s old “Jew Town” where the housing stock was even older and more decayed (Satter 2009). This was true even for more affluent African-Americans. Spear (1967: 26) notes, “The development of a physical ghetto in Chicago was not the result chiefly of poverty; nor did Negroes cluster out of choice. The ghetto was primarily the product of White hostility.”

*Early Suburbanization of Chicago’s African-Americans*

As mentioned, African-Americans are by no means new to the suburbs. Of the 5,000 Blacks that lived in the suburbs by 1910: 20 percent lived in Evanston a wealthy near north commuter suburb, another
20 percent lived in Aurora, Harvey, and Joliet--satellite cities based on steel and railroad jobs--and as many as 10 percent lived as servants in White homes. African-Americans continued to suburbanize during the Great Migration; one in every six migrants moved to the suburbs and by 1940 the suburban Black population of Chicago was 25,000 (Weiss 2004: 49). Most Black suburban migrants went to industrial suburbs. In Chicago, 30 percent of suburban Blacks lived in steel industry towns. African-Americans also lived in wealthy commuter suburbs typically as low-paid service workers living in cheaper and less desirable locations. Furthermore, many working class African-Americans migrated to suburban residential areas where they could buy cheap land and build their own homes (Weiss 2004: 27).

By the end of the Second Migration, African-Americans were a highly urbanized population in Chicago and in the nation as a whole; more than 80% of African-Americans in the country lived in central cities. Southern streetcar suburbs aside, most Black suburbs were working class and long established as African-American communities. Racial discrimination limited Blacks from living in the majority of the nation's suburbs and those suburbs that African-Americans entered were more isolated and less desirable than their White counterparts. Yet, African-Americans were part of American's early decentralization process and established suburbs of their own.

The number of Black suburbanites in the nation grew by one million between 1940 and 1960. By 1960, nearly 80,000 African-American's lived in the suburbs of Chicago. However, suburbanization followed prewar migration patterns; old communities became places of increased African-American suburban development. In hopes of creating a buffer, White landowners often left land next to Black suburbs vacant. Fears of mixed neighborhoods often led to quick racial turnover in neighborhoods adjacent to these communities. In Chicago, a mere seven localities absorbed 75 percent of the increased African-American population between 1940 and 1960. All were pre-existing African-American communities. In some suburbs of Chicago like Evanston and Maywood, African-Americans moved into previously White homes as White families moved to new suburbs. In other suburbs like Robbins and Dixmoor, those that were unincorporated or incorporated but majority Black, White homeowners lacked the regulation to block new Black buyers.
Increased Black Mobility: The Black Middle Class, Civil Rights, and Increased Suburbanization

During the 1960s and 1970s, the Black suburban population doubled. African-Americans moved to the suburbs at a faster pace than Whites. One explanation for this growth is that dense Black neighborhoods had expanded to reach municipal boundaries. But the outmigration equally reflected the conditions of inner city Black neighborhoods. A long absence of industrial jobs coupled with continued displacement from urban renewal had led to extreme poverty and unemployment for the lower and working class, while national economic prosperity had led to a new White collar Black middle class in search of better housing. Weiss (2004: 211) summarizes: “fueled by rising incomes, growing population, deterioration, and demolition at the urban core, Black neighborhoods ‘spilled over’ into the surrounding ring.”

Additionally, Civil Rights legislation improved Black mobility. First, early federal legislation banning discrimination in employment helped Blacks earn better wages. Second, housing discrimination legislation at the local level culminated in the Federal Fair Housing Act of 1968, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act 1975 and the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 prohibiting discrimination by race in the sale or rental of housing. Third, in 1966 a group of tenants sued the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) which ended the construction of the high-rise projects that perpetuated racial segregation. In Gautreaux v. Chicago Housing Authority the plaintiffs alleged that the CHA and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) were complicit in the creation of racially segregated neighborhoods through tenant and site selection policies (e.g. only placing projects in the Black Belt). A federal decision enjoined the CHA from building additional public housing in Black residential areas and ordered the agency to build housing in a “scattered site” manner. Following this decision the CHA built only a few additional public housing units and almost all were built for the elderly only (Choldin 2005). Furthermore, this series of class action lawsuits lead to the Gautreaux Assisted Housing Program in 1976. The program intended to remedy past segregation by offering interested plaintiffs the opportunity to use Section 8 housing vouchers to find housing throughout the Chicago metropolitan region. By 1998 the Gautreaux program was terminated after relocating 7,100 families. More than half of these families moved to the suburbs (Fischer 2005).

Fourth, increased suburbanization is also explained as an expansion of the dual housing market as a high level of construction led to new White suburbs. The majority of Blacks moved into neighborhoods that were older and less attractive to White buyers. Areas that were previously closed to Blacks were now
open, but in many cases only Blacks were moving in. Generally White suburbs remained opposed to Black neighbors and Blacks challenging White suburban boundaries continued to be met with threats, violence, and vandalism. If these efforts failed, Whites exercised residential choice of their own and moved away (Weiss 2004). Despite civil rights and increased suburbanization segregation remained paramount. Thus, aside from a few high-income families that moved into majority White neighborhoods, increased Black mobility of the 1960s and 1970s reflected the expansion of a racially segmented housing market (Clay 1979).

**Recent African-American Outmigration**

In the 1980s and 1990s the nation’s African-American suburban population reached nearly 12 million; by 2000, 1/3 of African-Americans lived in the suburbs. Chicago’s central city African-American population fell in the 1980s for the first time since the City’s incorporation in 1837 (Census data). Meanwhile, over 100,000 Blacks entered Chicago’s suburbs—a 64 percent increase. By 1990, 19 percent of Chicago’s African-American population lived in the suburbs even when excluding satellite cities with considerable African-American populations. By 2000 this proportion had reached 27 percent (Stuart 2002).

Suburban residential choice mirrored the needs and desires of the past: the price, size, and quality of housing, journey to work, neighborhood amenities, and quality of schools (Weiss 2004). However, violence and the desire for personal safety became increasingly important variables. African-American suburbanites across the nation identified urban crime as a principal motivation for outmigration (Weiss 2004:265). During the 1990s, Chicago’s crime was 50% higher than the mid-1980s and three times higher than the 1970s (Reardon 1993). In a survey of 3,000 people who left Chicago in 1992, “the desire for a safer place to live” was the leading response for why people chose to relocate (Reardon 1993).

Recent Black suburbanization has also coincided with a “reverse migration” to the south. While there was almost no Black population growth in the South during the 1960s, the region has increasingly recorded a larger proportion of African-American population gains in the country. About half of the nation’s African-American population growth occurred in the south in the 1970s, about two-thirds by the 1990s, and about three quarters by the 2000s. Movement of northern Blacks to the South is a major factor in this shift and most of these African-Americans are moving to the suburbs (Tavernise and Gebeloff 2011). By 2010, Atlanta had replaced Chicago as the metropolitan area with the largest number of African-
Americans after New York City (2010 Census data).

Black suburbanization, then, is not a recent phenomenon. The long history of African-American's moving to the suburbs illustrates the struggle for Black residential choice where Blacks in the suburbs continually laid the foundations for future generations to come. However, as discussed in the literature review, Black suburbanization has, in the past, been a process of re-segregation and an exception to the spatial assimilation model.
Chapter 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Key Determinants of Residential Segregation

Critical to the debate on segregation is how much causal weight to assign socioeconomic status, racial discrimination, and racial preference. There are three different models of residential mobility to conceptualize segregation: the spatial assimilation model, the place stratification model, and the neighborhood preference model (Freeman 2000).

The Spatial Assimilation Model

The spatial assimilation model is rooted in the urban ecology tradition where spatial inequality is the natural result of social order, individuals reside in the space they are best suited, and every group follows a path to assimilation. Residential integration is an outcome of socioeconomic advancement and acculturation (Massey, 1985). Numerous variables that are important to social and economic well-being, such as health, education, and access to employment, are determined by residential location and therefore minorities convert socioeconomic gains into proximity with the majority population (Massey & Denton 1985). Suburbanization is typically identified as a key step in the process of spatial assimilation (Alba et al. 1999). The urban ecology tradition expected new ethnic groups to concentrate in crowded slums, the second generation to relocate in ethnic working class districts, and generations thereafter to assimilate at the edge of the city (Burgess 1925). Implicit in the model is the advantage that comes from White neighborhoods (Alba and Logan 1993; Sandoval 2011). It ignores both persistent inequality deployed by spatial practices (e.g. redlining and steering) and actions to overcome it (e.g. Black efforts to enter the suburbs).

Early studies on the spatial assimilation processes of European immigration in the late 19th and 20th century and more recent research on Latino and Asian immigration in the late 21st century have gener-

Both voluntary and involuntary forces contribute to residential segregation. The former reflects the desire to be among compatriots while the latter reflects the imposition of restrictions on residential mobility on one group by another. However, the distinction is somewhat ambiguous as the label of “voluntary” or “involuntary” depends on the causal processes. That is, discrimination or harassment may lead to the members of a group to choose to live with their own compatriots. For full discussion see Carter & Lieberson (1982).
ally confirmed the model. For example, using 1980 Census data, Massey and Denton (1987) showed that in metropolitan areas in which Asians and Hispanics have higher incomes, where Hispanics were more likely to speak English, and Asians were more likely to be U.S. born, these groups were more likely to live in the suburbs and therefore experience lower levels of segregation. A study by Freeman (2000) on Boston and Los Angeles found that Asians and Latino immigrants integrate with Whites as they gain socioeconomic status and become acculturated to American society. Freeman (2000:32) concludes: “For Asians and Latinos the traditional model of spatial assimilation appears to be working.”

However, the spatial assimilation model has not explained segregation patterns of African-Americans (Massey, 1985; Alba & Logan, 1993; Denton & Massey 1988, Farley, 1990, Freeman, 2000). While it might be expected that African-Americans assimilate into White neighborhoods, in reality they have been much less successful than other minority groups at integration even as their socioeconomic status has risen (Freeman 2000).

The Place Stratification Model

In contrast to the spatial assimilation model, the place stratification model maintains that race is a major force in determining the spatial distribution of groups (Sandoval 2011). The model developed out of the inability of spatial assimilation theory to explain the spatial patterns of African-Americans and Puerto Ricans (Freeman 2000). The theory posits that space is a hierarchy of locations ordered by desirability and quality of life, Whites occupy the highest order, and Whites keep disadvantaged groups out via methods that are both public (e.g. redlining and exclusionary zoning) and private (e.g. violence, steering, or neighborhood exit) (Logan 1978; Alba and Logan 1993; Sandoval 2011). Implicit in the model is that the impact of race is relative. That is, race will affect Blacks more than Latinos because they have a lower social standing. As such, opportunity costs to move to different neighborhoods will be higher the lower the social standing of the group and housing discrimination continues to supplement social and economic inequality for minorities (Yinger 1995).

Residential Preferences Model

While the place stratification model focuses on the exogenous forces behind involuntary segrega-
tion, neighborhood preferences have been used to explain voluntary residential segregation. Schelling (1971) argued that minor distinctions in individual preferences lead to major segregation of society. For example, the preference of individuals to speak Spanish might lead to the segregation of an all Latino neighborhood while the preference of White individuals to live among others that look White might lead to the segregation of an all-White neighborhood. In Schelling’s contained neighborhood, every individual is concerned about the composition of the neighborhood and every individual prefers one combination of preferences to an alternative combination. Households remain in an area until that composition changes. When a new minority enters a neighborhood, at least one White household’s preference threshold is exceeded, causing the household to leave. Another minority, with a preference to live in an integrated neighborhood, enters this vacant household and therefore pushes the minority percentage in the neighborhood. Another White household’s preference threshold is exceeded, this household leaves, and the cycle perpetuates into rapid racial turnover (Massey and Denton 1993:96).

The pattern of immigrant minorities to cluster first in residential enclaves is consistent with the residential preferences model (i.e. their “preference” to live amongst each other). Furthermore, Schelling’s models have been used to argue that race-preferences maintained segregation prior to 1970 while changes in racial preferences encouraged racial integration in the 1970s and 1980s (Clark 1991). Reviews of racial preference suggest that, in the aggregate, Black households favor integration more than White households (Pettigrew 1973, Farley 1978, Massey & Denton 1993). In contrast, White households are only willing to live in “integrated” neighborhoods if they contain a small proportion of Black households (Clark 1991).

Schelling’s model assumes that information is perfect, that there are no “minority seeking” individuals, and that there are no transaction costs in moving (Clark, 1991). Furthermore, the model implicitly assumes a racially segregated housing market maintained by discrimination. While prejudice is a necessary pre-condition for the perpetuation of segregation, active discrimination must also occur (Massey & Denton 1993). Segregation is the result of collective action taken by Whites to live separately from Blacks. Involuntary segregation is maintained by policy instruments and organized activities (Logan 1987, Massey and Denton 1993, Cutler, Glaeser and Vigdor 1997). Realtor and property owners use zoning, building, and business permits to harass potential Black purchasers or White sellers (Logan, 1987) while White municipal governments can manipulate housing and welfare programs to block Black residents (Logan 1987). Police forces can ignore criminal acts in which Blacks are victims, and threats and firebombing can
discourage Blacks from moving into White neighborhoods.

**Suburban Segregation**

Based on these theories there are reasons to expect reductions in levels of segregation as African-Americans move to the suburbs. First, housing policies such as the Federal Fair Housing Act (1968), the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (1975), and the Community Reinvestment Act (1977) should discourage involuntary segregation by challenging methods used by Whites to keep Blacks out of neighborhoods. Foremost, the FHA prohibited the kinds of discrimination that had evolved to deny Blacks equal access to housing. It made it unlawful to refuse to the rent or sale of a home to any person based on race; it prohibited racial discrimination in the terms and conditions of a rental or sale; it banned real estate agents from making untrue statements about housing availability based on race; it banned discrimination in real estate advertising; and it prohibited “block busting.”

Second, the growth of the Black middle class should contribute to increased integration. The economic status of Blacks compared to that of Whites has improved; the medium income of Black households increased from 58% of White households in 1980 to 66% of White households by 2000. Furthermore, the poverty of Blacks declined by 31% in the 1990s (Weiss 2004).

Third, because segregation results from the unwillingness of Whites to remain when Blacks move into their neighborhoods, the liberalization of White attitudes (i.e. changed preferences) should decrease segregation. In 1963, Whites were asked by the University of Chicago’s National Opinion Research whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement “White people have the right to keep Blacks out of their neighborhood if they want to, and Blacks should respect that right” and 60% agreed. In 1980 and 1996 the question was asked again and the same response dropped to 34% and 13% respectively (Logan, Stults, Farley 2004). A 1996 study conducted by the Metro Chicago Information Center found that only three percent of Whites in the region wanted racial separation by neighborhood (The Gallup Organization 1997: X). Similar studies in other regions have shown declines in White racial prejudice. Furthermore, exposure to Blacks in the suburbs may result in a growing tolerance among Whites for racial diversity (Charles 2003). Finally, these reasons should be augmented by the construction of new housing where new neighborhoods don't have the stigma as places where only Blacks live or as places of White hostility (Farley and
Previous research on segregation has documented slow average declines in Black-White segregation across metropolitan regions since the 1970s. However, these reports have typically concluded that the factors (mentioned above) expected to accelerate Black-White integration have failed to have much of an effect and that levels of segregation are not simply explained by income level differences and housing costs. Jakubs (1986) concluded that segregation had declined in the majority of 318 metropolitan areas but reductions in Black-White segregation were mainly found in metropolitan areas with small Black populations. Farley and Frey (1994) found evidence of declines of Black segregation between 1980 and 1990. However, they also concluded that large declines were in smaller metropolitan areas with lower Black populations and in areas of new migration where segregation was less entrenched. Massey and Denton (1993) argued that a decline in areas with lower Black populations paradoxically confirms the persisting significance of segregation where Whites will tolerate Black neighbors only in small numbers. Logan, Stults, and Farley (2004) found that in almost every metropolitan area there was some decline in segmentation during the 1990s but it was minimal and varied greatly by region.

However, few studies have focused specifically on the relationship between African-American suburbanization and segregation. Early research by Massey and Denton noted that “In spite of Blacks increasing entry into suburbs…studies done in the 1970s and earlier suggest that suburban residence does not necessarily bring integration for Blacks” (1993: 70). More recent analysis suggests that levels of Black suburban segregation tend to be slightly lower than their central city counterparts (Charles 2003) yet Black suburbanites still experience much more segregation than other groups (Fischer 2008). Logan and Schneider (1984) examined the relationship between sharp increases in Black suburban growth and Black-White segregation between 1970 and 1980 and found little reduction in Black segregation patterns. Massey and Denton (1988) compared 1980 levels of Asian, Black, and Latino segregation from Whites in both the city and the suburbs separately. They found that Black suburbanites were highly segregated and that segregation was reduced only slightly in the suburbs. Alba, Logan, and Stults (2000) concluded that Blacks in the suburbs were more exposed to White residents than Blacks in the cities of Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit but that greater Black presence in the suburbs had a statistically significant correlation with increases in Black-White segregation. Using 1980 to 2000 Census data, Fischer (2008) partitioned metropolitan segregation into components of the city, the suburbs, and between the city and the suburbs to account for
the relationship between increased Black suburbanization and the degree of segregation Blacks experienced from other racial groups. Fischer concludes that much of the decline of metropolitan segregation of African-Americans from other racial groups is the result of declining segregation in central cities. Furthermore, the differential pace of this decline has decreased the difference in segregation between the City and the suburbs in all regions of the country except the west. The research design of this paper follows methods of Massey and Denton (1988) and Fischer (2008).

As for Chicago, in 1990, over 40 percent of its Black suburban population lived in just 14 out of 264 metropolitan suburbs all which had been occupied by Black families since the Great Migration. Furthermore, in the Cook County suburbs, home to over 60 percent of Chicago Black suburban population, the typical African-American family lived on a block that was less than 10% White (Weiss 2004: 268). Looking at housing and schooling across municipalities, Guy Stuart’s study on segregation in Chicago (2002) found extensive segregation across suburbs and school districts. His analysis concluded that 67% of all African-American’s living in an incorporated suburb of Chicago would have to move to achieve integration with White suburbanites. By examining house buying patterns Stuart additionally concluded that the situation was likely to worsen. Stuart (2002:39) notes: “We are reproducing the segregation in the suburbs with the same force as people 100 years ago first produced it in the city.” These studies suggest that African-American suburbanization should not be conflated with spatial assimilation theory.
Chapter 3
DATA AND RESEARCH DESIGN

The research deploys four components of segregation analysis to examine the question: is recent African-American outmigration from the City of Chicago leading to residential integration in the MSA? These components include: an overview of demographic change in the Chicago MSA, Indices of Segregation, ArcGIS Spatial Analysis, and descriptive statistics at the suburban municipal level. Finally, segregation analysis is supplemented by interviews with municipal planners in two suburban municipalities of large African-American in-migration between 2000 and 2010: Romeoville and Lansing. These interviews are taken up in the conclusion.

Exhibit 1: Chicago MSA

The research uses 1970-2010 U.S. Census data as its primary source for analysis. Data is extracted from the American Fact Finder and the Encyclopedia of Chicago websites. The Chicago Metropolitan Area is defined by the entirety of Seven Illinois Counties: Cook, Dupage, Kane, Kendall, Lake, McHenry, and Will.

Research for this thesis was granted permission by Columbia University’s Internal Review Board on December 8th, 2011.
County (Exhibit 1). This definition is one of many areas used for Chicago regional analysis and is chosen both for convenience of data extraction (the region is composed of full counties and contained within the single state of Illinois) and also as it is consistent with the jurisdictions of the Chicago Metropolitan Planning Agency, Chicago’s regional body for transportation and land use planning. The City of Chicago is defined by widely accepted political and administrative boundaries.

Exhibits documenting demographic change focus on the most recent and the most acute period of Chicago’s African-American suburbanization from the 2000 to 2010 Census. However indices and maps use data back to the 1980 Decennial Census—the first census conducted since large increases in African-American suburbanization and the first census conducted after the passage of fair housing policies as discussed in the background and literature review above. Data from 1970 is also used when available. These components allow for useful documentation and comparison of changes in both suburbanization and segregation over time. Data reaching beyond 10 years is also necessary as processes of suburbanization, segregation, and integration occur over unspecified amounts of time and not in the 10 year intervals when U.S. Census data is available. However, The 2000 to 2010 time period of recent Black suburbanization is the focus of descriptive statistics at the municipal level.

Census tract boundaries change by decade. Therefore, 1970 to 2000 Census data has been standardized across decades to match 2010 tract boundaries using data from U.S. 2010: America in the 20th Century. Segregation Indices and ArcGIS spatial analysis are constructed using these standardized boundaries. Census tracts are the spatial units used for lower level of analysis in constructing both segregation indices and maps. The few Census tracts that overlap between city and suburban boundaries are removed from racial index analysis that separates city and suburbs. Asians are defined by One-Race-Non-Hispanic-Asians; African-Americans are defined by “One-Race-Non-Hispanic-African-Americans; Whites are defined by One-Race-Non-Hispanic-Whites; Latinos are defined as one-race Hispanic or Latino; and Other is defined by any persons not matching the four former definitions.

Indices of Racial Segregation

This analysis begins by employing the standard indices of segregation to explore African-American segregation in the Chicago region over time: the Index of Dissimilarity (D) and the Index of Isolation (I).
The former, the most frequently used measure for segregation, is a measure of the evenness of distributions of two populations across a set of spatial units (i.e. Census tracts). Evenness is defined with respect to the racial composition of the aggregate area of analysis as a whole (i.e. the racial composition of the metropolitan region). Producing a number between 0 and 1, it is interpreted as the proportion of either population that would have to move from their current Census tract into a different Census tract in order to create an “even” residential pattern across the metropolitan region. A value of 0 implies complete integration; none of the population would have to move Census tracts for metropolitan integration. On the other side, a value of 1 implies complete segregation; 100% of one of the two populations would have to move Census tracts for overall integration in the metropolitan region. A simple rule of thumb for interpreting the D Index is that a value under 30 is low, a value between 30 and 60 is moderate, and value over 60 is high (Massey and Denton 1993). The D Index has three appealing features for this analysis: it has a long history in the writing on segregation, it is simple to calculate yet highly correlated with more sophisticated measures of residential segregation (Glaeser and Vigdor 2012), and it is invariant to the size of the groups being examined (Echenique and Fryer 2006). The latter feature of the D Index makes it possible to easily compare segregation levels for the MSA, the City, and the suburbs once computed separately. The formulation for the Index of Dissimilarity is shown in Equation 1 below:

\[ D = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left| \frac{b_i}{B} - \frac{w_i}{W} \right| \]

Where (comparing Black and White population):
- \( b_i \) = the Black population of the \( i^{th} \) Census tract
- \( B \) = the total Black population of the region for which the index of dissimilarity is calculated
- \( w_i \) = the White population of the \( i^{th} \) Census tract
- \( W \) = the total White population of the region for which the index of dissimilarity is calculated

The second most frequently used measure for segregation is the Index of Isolation (I). Index I calculates the percentage of a same group population across a set of spatial units (i.e. Census tracts). The I Index is referred to as a measure of “exposure” as it measures the extent to which one racial group is exposed only to itself (Massey and Denton 1993:287). Thus, while Index D documents a structural segregation be-
between two groups, Index I documents the concentration or “isolation” of just one group; i.e. an individual experience of segregation from the viewpoint of a typical member of one race/ethnicity (Alba, Logan, Stults, 2000). This Index supplements the D Index as it better accounts for Census tracts that have dramatically different racial make-up than the composition of the region as a whole (Glaeser and Vigdor 2012).

The I Index also results in a value between 0 and 1. A value of 0 suggests that a member of the population of analysis (e.g. the average African-American resident) experiences no racial isolation from the racial composition of the population as a whole; a value of 1 indicates that a member of the population of analysis experiences full racial isolation from the racial composition of the population as a whole. The index is highly variant dependent on the size of the group being examined and therefore less useful for comparisons across geographies. The formulation for the Index of Isolation is shown in Equation 2 below:

\[
I = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \frac{b_i}{B} \times \frac{b_i}{t_i} \right)
\]

Where (examining Black isolation):
- \(b_i\) = the Black population of the \(i^{th}\) Census tract
- \(B\) = the total Black population of the metropolitan region for which the index of Isolation is calculated
- \(t_i\) = the total population of the \(i^{th}\) Census tract

Finally, this analysis uses the Index of Entropy (H) to explore African-American segregation. Like the Index of Dissimilarity, the H Index compares diversity at one spatial unit of analysis (i.e. Census tract) to diversity at a higher level (i.e. metropolitan region). Equations 3 and 4 show the calculations for the diversity of the metropolitan area (\(E\)) and the analogous calculation for diversity at the individual Census tract (\(E_i\)):

\[
E = \sum_{b=1}^{N} \left| P_b \ln \frac{1}{P_b} \right| \quad E_i = \sum_{b=1}^{N} \left| P_{bi} \ln \frac{1}{P_{bi}} \right|
\]

Where:
- \(P_b\) = the proportion of the population of group b (Black) in the metropolitan region over all groups
- \(P_{bi}\) = the proportion of the population of group b (Black) in Census tract i composed over all
groups

$E$ and $E_i$ reach their minimum value of 0 when there is only one group present and reach their maximum value, $\ln (n)$, when each group is represented equally.

All logarithmic calculations use the natural log.

The H Index compares diversity at the lower level of analysis ($E_i$) to diversity at the aggregate level of analysis ($E$) weighted by the proportion of the aggregate population living in the smaller unit of analysis and summed over all units. The calculation of H is shown in Equation 5 below:

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^{N} t_i \frac{(E - E_i)}{ET}$$

Where:

- $E$ and $E_i$ represent regional diversity and the Census tracts respectively described in calculations above.
- $t_i$ = the total population of tract $i$.
- $T$ = the total population of the metropolitan region.

An H value of 0 implies each individual unit of analysis has the same diversity as the area of aggregate analysis while an H value of 1 implies that each unit of analysis maintains complete segregation compared to the diversity of the region as a whole.

While the D and I Index are the standard indices for segregation analysis, the H index holds two advantageous properties for this analysis. First, the H Index measures segregation among more than two groups at one time. Given Chicago’s large and increasing Latino and Asian populations (a point emphasized in the demographic overview below) the H index allows for analysis beyond myopic Black-White segregation measures. The index better examines Black segregation in a multi-racial Chicago metropolitan region and allows for a precise comparison of Black segregation to the segregation of other minority groups in the region. Therefore, the H Index is first used to show Black segregation in the Chicago MSA compared to other racial/ethnic groups.

Second, and more importantly, the H Index allows for decomposition of segregation by geographi-
cal component. This analysis follows the methods of Reardon, Yun, and Elite (2000) and Fischer (2008) by partitioning metropolitan segregation into within-city, within-suburb, and between city-and-suburb-components. Given this index is less frequently used in segregation analysis a review of these components is briefly discussed below. The general form of this decomposition can be found in Fischer (2008) and a full proof of this decomposition can be found in the appendix of Reardon, Yun, and Elite (2000). Equation 6 shows the decomposition of the H index into within-city, within-suburb, and between city-and-suburb-components:

\[ H = H_{cxs} + \frac{T_c E_c}{TE} H_c + \frac{T_s E_s}{TE} H_s \]

Where:

- \( H_{cxs} \) = the portion of metropolitan segregation attributed to the city-suburbs segregation

The remaining two elements represent the within-city and within-suburb components of metropolitan segregation calculated via the variables discussed above.

Each component of H represents the proportion of segregation that can be reduced by redistributing people between the city and the suburbs, within the city, or within the suburbs, respectively. Together these components equal the metropolitan segregation calculated as H above. The percentage of metropolitan segregation attributed to each component is then calculated by dividing each component by total metropolitan segregation (H). For example, the percentage of metropolitan segregation attributed to the suburbs is calculated as shown below:

\[ \frac{T_s E_s}{TE} \frac{H_s}{H} \]

This calculation is repeated for each component and the role and changing influence that each geographic component plays in overall segregation is discussed.

Indices of Dissimilarity, Isolation, and Entropy have limitations. First, while these indices illustrate how the racial composition of Census tracts differs from the racial composition of the metropolitan region as a whole, they fail to illustrate the locational aspect of the Census tracts being analyzed. A metropolitan
region with many segregated tracts clustered together reveals the same index as a metropolitan region with the same segregated Census tracts spread evenly through the region. Likewise, while indices illustrate aggregate changes in levels of regional segregation over time they fail to describe the movement of this change (e.g. which tracts and areas of the region are integrating or segregating).

Second, Indices of segregation depend on the ways in which a city is partitioned into Census tracts. Fixing the location of population by race and then redrawing the Census tracts would drastically change the resulting measures. That is, while segregation indices take the partitioning of a city as given, the area of study is more or less segregated depending on the how Census tracts are drawn (Echenique and Fryer 2006). This is particularly problematic for suburban vs. city segregation analysis as Census tracts become larger as one moves out from the central city towards the suburbs (see Exhibit 2). Consider a rectangular city consisting of four square Census tracts from left to right; the first entirely Black, the second entirely White, the third entirely Black, and the fourth entirely White. Now consider an identical rectangular suburb with the exact same population and distribution but split into two Census tracts down the middle of this rectangle; with the left tract being half Black and half White and the right tract being half Black and half White. An Index of Dissimilarity would measure the City with a score of 1 or totally segregated and the Suburb with a score of 0 or totally integrated. Yet, to any observer, the levels of segregation are exactly the same.

Third, indices of segregation don’t measure segregation at the level of the individual and therefore assume that individuals experience the average level of integration or segregation of their group. Consider an entirely Black Census tract surrounded by entirely White Census tracts. An individual living on the edge of the entirely Black Census tract (and next to an entirely White Census tract) may experience wholly different level of segregation than an individual living in the center of the entirely Black Census tract. However, all Indices of segregation aggregate to the group level and treat these individuals the same (Echenique and Fryer 2006).
Spatial Analysis

The analysis supplements racial indices by mapping Chicago metropolitan segregation with ArcGIS software. Spatial analysis is useful for examining the location aspect of segregation ignored by segregation indices (as discussed above). First, Dot Density maps document the residential locations of Chicago residents by the four major race/ethnicity groups living in the region: Asian, Black, Latino, and White for every Decennial Census Year from 1980 to 2010. These maps illustrate where African-Americans in the suburbs live compared to other racial groups over time and allow for examination of African-Americans residential patterns across the region. However, these maps do not reveal which suburban areas African-Americans are entering over time. Therefore, Dot Density Maps are also made to show where African-Americans and Whites have been moving over time from 1970 - 2010. For these maps, the value of each dot is adjusted to represent roughly the proportion of each race to the total in the region. That is, one African-American dot represents a third of the population of one White dot reflecting that the total African-American population is roughly a third of the total White population in the region. Finally, maps showing the percentage African-American out of the total population in each Census tract are used to document the concentration of African-Americans over time. A rounding of natural breaks is used for
the levels of concentration defined in these maps (e.g. 5-10% African-American). All maps are made using ArcGIS mapping software with Census tracts, adjusted to 2010 boundaries, used as the level of analysis.

The spatial analysis employed also has limitations that should be briefly discussed. Like indices of segregation, spatial analysis depends on the ways in which a city is partitioned into Census tracts. Most importantly, as Census tracts are the lowest level of readily available data for mapping individuals across space for the region, racial sorting, segregation, and integration at a lower level of analysis (e.g. at the block level) remains undocumented and misrepresented as non-existent. For example, consider two identical square Census tracts that are 25 percent Asian, 25 percent Black, 25 percent Latino, and 25 percent White. However consider that one of these Census tracts has racial groups equally distributed across the blocks within the tract while the other Census tract has each racial group living in only one square corner of the tract. ArcGIS software randomly distributes individuals within each Census tract with no information on where in the Census tract those individuals live. Thus, a map showing concentration of one race by color gradient will display these two tracts as exactly identical. In reality, segregation between the two tracts is clearly different.

Census tract maps are particularly problematic when comparing geographic components of the city and the suburbs. As discussed (exhibit 2), Census tracts become larger in area as one moves outward from the central city. As such, the random distribution of individuals within a Census tract is less accurate in the suburbs and inherently biased to make areas farther from the city core appear more integrated when block level sorting and segregation is at work.

**Municipal Level Analysis**

While Census tracts are useful units of disaggregation for segregation and mapping analysis they have little social or political meaning. Therefore, municipal level analysis is used to further examine African residential settlement and movement within boundaries of residential and social identification. A list of the 20 suburban municipalities with the largest net population in African-American population is compared to lists of the 20 suburban municipalities with the largest net population in White, Asian, and Latino populations, respectively. Asians, Whites and Latinos are also compared with each other. The number out of the top twenty municipalities that each racial combination shares in common is documented in
These suburbs can be thought of as “shared suburbs” or “suburbs of overlap” by net population. This number compares which different racial combinations are living in the same municipalities. Thereafter, to illustrate how recent African-American residential movement compares with the recent residential movement of other racial ethnic groups a list of the 20 suburban municipalities with the largest net increase in African-American population (from 2000-2010) is compared to lists of the 20 suburban municipalities with the largest net increase in White, Asian, and Latino populations (from 2000-2010). Asians, Whites and Latinos are again compared with each other. An analogous table is constructed for “shared suburbs” or “suburbs of overlap” by population increase. Finally, the change in White population in the 20 suburban municipalities with largest net increases in African-American population is documented to examine if suburbs of recent African-American entrance appear to be experiencing racial turnover.

**Municipal Interviews**

Finally, two interviews were conducted with municipal planning departments in two suburban municipalities of large African-American in-migration between 2000 and 2010. The first interview was conducted on March 9th, 2012 with Nathan Darga, head of the Department of Planning for the Village of Romeoville, Illinois. According to 2010 Census data, over the last ten years Romeoville nearly doubled in population with large increases in the proportion of all racial/ethnic groups. The suburb has become significantly more diverse. The Latino population went from representing 13% to 29%, the African-American population from 5% to 12%, and the Asian population from 2% to 6% of the suburb’s total population, respectively. While the White population proportion declined from 84% to 45%, it experienced an 11% population growth over the 10 years. Romeoville gained over 3000 African-Americans in the last ten years. It is one of only three suburbs in the Chicago MSA that experienced a large influx in African-American population (in both number and proportion) and still experienced White population growth.

A second interview was conducted on March 12th, 2012 with Kristi Delaurentiis, Director of Planning and Development in the Village of Lansing, Illinois. According to 2010 Census data, Lansing’s total population has remained almost unchanged over the last ten years while the racial composition has experienced a dramatic shift. The White population in Lansing decreased by almost 9000 people while the African-American population increased by almost 6000 people and the Latino population increased by nearly 2000 people. The population of Lansing was 82% White and 10% African-American in 2000 and 52% White.
and 31% African-American by 2010. Given the small sample size, these interviews were only used to supplement the discussion. A list of questions used for the interviews can be found in the Appendix.
Chapter 4
RESULTS

Overview

According to 2010 Census data the Seven County Chicago MSA is home to roughly 8.4 million residents with about 62% of the residents living within Cook County and 32% living within the central City. Between 2000 and 2010 the MSA grew by about 3.6%. Despite this growth, both the central city and the near suburbs (Cook County) saw sharp declines in population. Metropolitan growth is shifting outwards towards the lower population suburban counties: Kane, Kendall, Lake, McHenry, and Will. These demographics are shown in Exhibit 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Percent of Region (2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>2,896,016</td>
<td>2,695,598</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook County</td>
<td>5,376,741</td>
<td>5,194,675</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupage County</td>
<td>904,161</td>
<td>916,924</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane County</td>
<td>404,119</td>
<td>515,269</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall County</td>
<td>54,544</td>
<td>114,736</td>
<td>110.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>644,356</td>
<td>703,462</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry County</td>
<td>260,077</td>
<td>308,760</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will County</td>
<td>502,266</td>
<td>677,560</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 County MSA</td>
<td>8,150,789</td>
<td>8,444,447</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 3: Chicago MSA Population Change Overview, 2000-2010

The 2010 Census data also reveal large demographic shifts taking place within the MSA. The African-American and White populations declined in the region by about 5% and 3% respectively while the Asian and Latino populations increased by about 38% and 29% respectively. Significantly, The City's African-American population declined by nearly 200,000 people (a 17% decline) explaining nearly 90%
of the City’s net population loss, while the suburban population grew by over 110,000 people (a 22% increase). The White population declined in both the City and the suburbs at roughly 6% and 2% respectively. Thus, regional growth is explained by Asian and Latino population gains in the city and especially the suburbs. The Latino population grew at 3% within the central city while the suburban population experienced nearly a 60% increase. Likewise, the Asian population grew by nearly 16% in the City while it saw an almost a 50% increase in the suburbs. These demographic shifts are explored in Exhibit 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>-17.2</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 County MSA</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 4: Chicago MSA Percent Change by Race and Ethnicity, 2000-2010

On the surface 2010 Census data demographic shifts have resulted in suburbs and an MSA that is more integrated than ten years earlier; the White suburban population proportion decreased from over 70% to 62% of the total suburban population and all other racial groups increased their population proportion in the suburbs.
### A. 2000:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1,053,739 (36.4%)</td>
<td>907,166 (31.3%)</td>
<td>753,644 (26.0%)</td>
<td>124,437 (4.3%)</td>
<td>2,896,016 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>466,623 (10.0%)</td>
<td>3,300,096 (70.5%)</td>
<td>614,221 (13.1%)</td>
<td>229,717 (4.9%)</td>
<td>5,254,773 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 County MSA</td>
<td>1,520,362 (20.1%)</td>
<td>4,207,262 (55.5%)</td>
<td>1,367,865 (18.0%)</td>
<td>354,154 (4.7%)</td>
<td>8,150,789 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B. 2010:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>872,286 (32.4%)</td>
<td>854,717 (31.7%)</td>
<td>778,862 (28.9%)</td>
<td>144,903 (5.4%)</td>
<td>2,695,598 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>573,297 (11.0%)</td>
<td>323,913,2 (62.0%)</td>
<td>978,249 (18.7%)</td>
<td>343,035 (6.6%)</td>
<td>5,548,431 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 County MSA</td>
<td>1,445,583 (18.3%)</td>
<td>4,093,849 (51.7%)</td>
<td>1,757,111 (22.2%)</td>
<td>487,938 (6.2%)</td>
<td>8,444,447 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 5: Chicago MSA Total and Percentage of Total by Race/Ethnicity by Area
A closer look at outmigration reveals a more confined outward movement from the City to the suburbs for African-Americans. The majority of African-American suburbanization took place in the inner ring suburbs of Chicago within Cook County. Municipalities in southern Cook County saw the largest African-American growth which is detailed later on in the maps of Exhibit 13. After suburban Cook County, Dupage County directly to the west of Cook County, and Will County directly to the south of Cook County, saw the majority of African-American population. While Kendall and McHenry County saw extremely large percentage increases in African-American suburbanization, 51% of net African-American suburbanization gains occurred in suburban Cook County while 85% of net African-American suburbanization gains in occurred in Cook County, Dupage County and Will County alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1,053,739</td>
<td>872,286</td>
<td>-181,454</td>
<td>-17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook County</td>
<td>1,390,448</td>
<td>1,265,778</td>
<td>-124,670</td>
<td>-9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook (Suburban)</td>
<td>336,809</td>
<td>393,492</td>
<td>56,783</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupage County</td>
<td>26,977</td>
<td>41,024</td>
<td>14,047</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kane County</td>
<td>22,477</td>
<td>27,819</td>
<td>5,342</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall County</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>6,343</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>815.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake County</td>
<td>43,580</td>
<td>46,989</td>
<td>3,409</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHenry County</td>
<td>1,379</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>120.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will County</td>
<td>51,980</td>
<td>74,419</td>
<td>22,439</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 County MSA</td>
<td>1,537,534</td>
<td>1,465,417</td>
<td>-72,177</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 6: Chicago MSA African-American Population Change by Geography, 2000-2010

Segregation Indices

The demographic overview (discussed above) illustrated how African-Americans are increasingly entering the suburbs. If this suburbanization fits a spatial assimilation model than we should expect African-American segregation levels in the metropolitan region, as measured by segregation indices, to decrease at an accelerated pace alongside this accelerated suburbanization. Similarly, as African-Americans move to the suburbs, we should expect the level of segregation in the suburbs to decline at a faster rate than that of the City.
The Index of Dissimilarity (D) and the Index of Isolation (I) reveal that segregation in the Chicago MSA has declined in every Decennial Census since 1970 but at a slow pace; a pace that is not accelerating alongside increases in African-American outmigration from the central city to the suburbs. The current D Index of .76 for the MSA implies that 76 percent of African-Americans would still have to move to a different Census tract in order for Blacks and Whites to be equally distributed across the MSA. The value is considered very high and well above the national average for U.S cities which ranges from 60 to 65. The I Index of .66 suggests that the average African-American in the region continues to live in a Census tract that is roughly 66% Black while the African-American population of the MSA represents only about 20% of the total population.

Separating the City from the suburban tracts for the D Index reveals that levels of segregation in the suburbs are lower than that of the City in every Census year since 1970. However, levels of segregation remain extremely high in both geographies. The D index for the City implies that 73 percent of African-Americans living in the City would have to re-locate within the City in order for Blacks and Whites to be equally distributed across the City. Likewise, the D Index for the suburbs reveals that 66 percent of African-Americans living in the suburbs would have to re-locate within the suburbs in order for Blacks and Whites to be equally distributed across the suburbs. The level of segregation in the City actually declined at a faster pace in the last ten years than the level of segregation in the suburbs and the difference between the levels of segregation in the City and suburbs has decreased significantly over the last ten years (See Exhibit 5).
Furthermore, persistent levels of segregation are not merely the product of economic disparities between African-Americans and Whites. Exhibit 9 shows the D Index for Chicago residents with household incomes of over $75,000 in both the City and the suburbs separately. The level of segregation for “wealthy” African-Americans remains high at both levels of geography; the level of segregation in the suburbs is almost unchanged between 2000 and 2010; and the level of segregation amongst this wealth bracket declined at a faster rate in the City than in the suburbs between 2000 and 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The H Index confirms that levels of Black segregation remain very high and have declined at a slow and steady pace regardless of increased outmigration from the central city to the suburbs. The unique properties of the H Index also allow for measurement of segregation among more than two groups simultaneously. As discussed, this supplements analysis from the D Index which only indicates segregation.

Household income of over $75,000 was selected as it is an income bracket provided by the U.S. Census Bureau and is well above the median household income in both the Chicago MSA and the Nation.
levels between two groups of comparison (e.g. Black and White). Levels of African-American segregation remain remarkably high when compared to other racial groups. Asians, Latinos, and Whites all experienced noticeably higher levels of integration than Blacks in the Chicago MSA. These results give some weight to a place stratification model where a racial hierarchy is being played out in space.

A. African-American, 1970-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. All Races, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 10: Chicago MSA Entropy (H) Index

The H Index also allows for decomposition of segregation by different level of geography and therefore further examination of the relationship between increased African-American suburbanization and the slowly declining levels of segregation highlighted above. Exhibit 11 depicts how much each geographical element (i.e. the city, the suburbs, and between city and suburbs) contributes to African-American segregation in the entire Chicago MSA. As African-Americans have shifted from the central city to the suburbs the composition of metropolitan segregation has changed. From 1970 to 2010, segregation in the city has accounted for increasingly less metropolitan segregation. In 1970, a full movement towards de-segregation in the city alone would decrease metropolitan segregation by roughly 23% yet by 2010 this number was down to 18%. In contrast, while the suburbs show lower levels of segregation than the city, over time they have increased their influence in metropolitan segregation. In 1980 full de-segregation within the suburbs alone would only reduce metropolitan segregation by 11% yet by 2010 this number had reached 23%. Segregation in the suburbs is now a greater contributor to metropolitan segregation than
segregation in the City. The majority of segregation from 1970 until 2010 has in the past and remains to be explained by unequal distribution across city and suburban boundaries. That is, the majority of metropolitan segregation can still be reduced by movement from the city to the suburbs or from the suburbs to the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>Between City and Suburb</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Share 1970</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Share 1980</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Share 1990</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Share 2000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Share 2010</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 11: Chicago MSA H Index for African-Americans Decomposed by Geography, 1970-2010

Spatial Analysis

As discussed in the research design, indices of segregation ignore the spatial component of population distribution and thus fail to illustrate the locational aspect of the individual units (e.g. Census tracts) being analyzed. Therefore, Exhibit 12 provides Dot Density Maps of residence by race in each Decennial Census year between 1980 and 2010 in order to better examine segregation in space. Spatial analysis provides a more somber reality of Black-White segregation than declining indices suggest. The maps illustrate that all race groups have continually sprawled into the suburbs over time. Furthermore, both Asian and Latino residential patterns in the MSA appear somewhat to be fitting a spatial assimilation model; their suburban residential patterns have become clearly more integrated as their presence in the suburbs has increased. In contrast, Black suburban residential patterns do not resemble dispersal within space but rather suggest
the continued expansion of residential locations existing since the 1970s. The expansion to the western and especially the southern suburbs of Chicago appear as an extension of the Black belt and locations of African-American residence are only slightly less clustered in 2010 as were in 1970. However, in a few suburban areas southwest of the City, African-Americans are currently living in integrated Census tracts. Interestingly, in these tracts, African-Americans had a residential presence dating back to at least the 1970s and integration is occurring with a noticeable presence of Asians and Latinos.

Exhibit 13 then provides Dot Density Maps of areas of population gain for African-Americans and Whites for each Decennial Census ten-year-period between 1980 and 2010. Therefore, while Exhibit 9 illustrates where African-Americans are living in each Decennial Census year, Exhibit 10 locates the areas that are gaining both African-American and White residents between these periods. The maps re-iterate the increase in Black suburbanization from 1980 to 2010; by 2010 almost all areas of Black population growth are occurring in the suburbs. Furthermore, African-Americans are clearly moving into new Census tracts in every ten year period from 1970 forward. However, as African-American's move into the suburbs Whites have continually moved farther from the central city and deeper into the MSA. By 2010 almost no Whites are moving into the inner ring suburbs and almost all White population growth is occurring on the edge of the MSA or in the downtown area of the central city.

Finally, Exhibit 14 is used to show the proportion of African-Americans in each Census tract across time. While the Chicago MSA is nearly 20% Black, the majority of its tracts remain remarkably under 5% so. Concentration maps reveal an expansion of segregated space as African-Americans continue to push outward into the suburbs. The growing number of tracts becoming 50 to 80 percent Black or over 80% Black in suburban Cook County indicates continued racial turnover and gives some weight to a residential preferences model. Likewise, the lack of an African-American presence between contiguous Census tracts with noticeable African-American proportions gives some support to the place stratification or residential preferences model where African-Americans are only entering certain tracts where other African-Americans have entered.
Exhibit 12: Chicago MSA Dot Density Maps of Where Residents are Living, 1980-2010
Exhibit 14: Chicago MSA African-American Concentration Maps, 1970-2010
Municipal Level Analysis

While Census tracts are useful units of disaggregation for segregation indexes and mapping analysis they have no social or political meaning. Furthermore, when visually comparing the proportion of African-Americans in the City to African-Americans in the suburbs, maps bias declines in segregation towards the suburban Census tracts which are larger. Therefore, as explained in the research design, Exhibit 15 takes the 20 suburbs of largest population and largest increase in population by each race separately and compares where these suburbs overlap between different racial combinations. Municipal level analysis confirms the findings above: despite increased entrance into the suburbs, African-Americans appear to be living and moving into less integrated municipalities than their Asian, Latino and White counterparts. In fact, only one of the twenty largest municipalities of African-American residence was also one of the largest municipalities of White residence in 2010. Likewise, of the top twenty municipalities of African-American population gain between 2000 and 2010, only two were also top municipalities for White population in-migration. Every other racial group shares more suburban municipalities with Whites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Overlapping Suburbs</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Overlapping Suburbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Asian-Black</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-Latino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Asian-Latino</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-White</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Asian-White</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Black-Latino</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Black-White</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino-White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Latino-White</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 15: Chicago MSA Suburban Municipalities of Racial Overlap by Racial Pair

*Suburban municipalities exclude Satellite city suburbs of Aurora, Elgin, Evanston, Joliet, North Chicago, and unincorporated areas.
Interestingly, while Blacks are not living in or moving into the same suburban municipal boundaries as Whites, they appear to be moving into the same municipalities as Asians and Latinos. An examination of the absolute number of overlapping suburbs by each race group highlights this finding (Exhibit 16 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Overlapping Suburbs</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Overlapping Suburbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian-All others</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Asian-All others</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black- All others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Black- All others</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino-All others</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Latino-All others</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-All others</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>White-All others</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 16: Chicago MSA Suburban Municipalities of Racial Overlap

*Suburban municipalities exclude Satellite city suburbs of Aurora, Elgin, Evanston, Joliet, North Chicago, and unincorporated areas.

Finally, White change in the 20 suburban municipalities with the largest increase in African-American population between 2000 and 2010 is documented. At the municipal level African-American suburbanization between the periods of 2000 and 2010 appears to be the same story as movement within the City in the decades preceding, a story of racial turnover and segregation. Out of the 20 suburbs with the largest African-American increase in this period, 17 experienced sharp declines in White population while only three experienced a White population increase. These three suburbs, Crest Hill, Plainville and Romeoville are adjacent to each other in the far southwest suburbs of Will County. This cluster of African-American population gain can be located in the Dot Density maps of Exhibit 13. The municipalities have had a comparatively large Black presence and in migration since 1980 and also a large presence and in migration of Asians and Latinos.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Black Increase 2010</th>
<th>White Change 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matteson</td>
<td>6800</td>
<td>-1247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansing</td>
<td>5864</td>
<td>-8557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calumet City</td>
<td>5358</td>
<td>-8493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Holland</td>
<td>5068</td>
<td>-5641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Forest</td>
<td>3833</td>
<td>-5653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richton Park</td>
<td>3782</td>
<td>-2689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romeoville</td>
<td>3424</td>
<td>3656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolingbrook</td>
<td>3411</td>
<td>-2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sauk Village</td>
<td>3173</td>
<td>-3044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood</td>
<td>3117</td>
<td>-4014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berwyn</td>
<td>2785</td>
<td>-12884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naperville</td>
<td>2676</td>
<td>-2783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynwood</td>
<td>2549</td>
<td>-1251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Lawn</td>
<td>2227</td>
<td>-6009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainfield</td>
<td>2046</td>
<td>17271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Park</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>-4265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-9091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flossmoor</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>-1806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenwood</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>-2213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crest Hill</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>2554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Suburban municipalities exclude Satellite city suburbs of Aurora, Elgin, Evanston, Joliet, North Chicago, and unincorporated areas.
Chapter 5
CONCLUSION

Summary of the Findings

Analysis for this thesis confirms that Blacks are both increasingly suburbanized and that the segregation of African-Americans from Whites and other racial/ethnic groups has been steadily declining in the Chicago MSA since the 1970s. However, recent African-American outmigration from Chicago is generally leading to re-segregation in the region’s suburbs and African-American entrance into the suburbs has not fit a spatial assimilation model. The Index of Dissimilarity reveals that levels of Black-White segregation remain very high in both the City and suburbs even amongst residents with high levels of household wealth. Furthermore, the D Index indicates that from 2000 to 2010, a period of increased African-American outmigration to the suburbs, segregation decline was actually faster in the City than in the suburbs. By 2010, 66 percent of African-Americans living in the suburbs would have to re-locate within the suburbs in order for Blacks and Whites to be equally distributed across the suburbs. The Index of Isolation confirms declining yet persistently high levels of segregation in the region; African-Americans continue to live in a Census tract that is on average 66% Black while the African-American population of the MSA represents less than 20% of the total population.

The Entropy Index confirms that African-Americans remain uniquely segregated when compared to other racial groups in the Chicago MSA. Moreover, the decomposition of the Entropy Index reveals an ever increasing importance of the suburbs in explaining levels of metropolitan segregation. Since 2010, the suburbs of Chicago have been a noticeably greater contributor to metropolitan segregation than the City. This makes sense: as African-Americans have moved to, and increased their presence in, segregated or re-segregating suburbs, these areas are becoming more important in explaining residential segregation levels across the region. However, the majority of metropolitan segregation remains explained by unequal distribution across city and suburban boundaries and metropolitan segregation can be most reduced by population movement from the city to the suburbs or from the suburbs to the City.

Spatial analysis of where African-American residents are living, moving, and concentrated over
time supports findings from racial indices analysis. Dot Density maps show that Asians and Latinos appear to fitting a spatial assimilation model as their presence in the suburbs has increased; that African-American suburbanization has generally been towards the southern and western suburbs radiating out from the Black Belt of the City; that African-Americans and Whites are not living or moving to the same Census tracts of the region; that the majority of the Chicago MSA still remains remarkably under 5% African-American; and that the suburbs, especially the suburban Census tracts to the West and South of the City, are experiencing racial turnover. Over time segregation has expanded from the City into the southern Cook County suburbs and to contiguous tracts in other suburbs west of the City. However, spatial analysis also reveals certain census tracts where Blacks appear to be integrating; these tracts have had an African-American presence since at least the 1970s and these tracts have a noticeable presence and in-migration of Asians and Latinos.

Municipal level descriptive statistics suggests African-Americans are generally living and moving into different suburban municipalities than other racial groups and that Whites are leaving suburban municipalities of Black entrance. This suggests increasing suburbanization of Blacks may be resulting in drops in metropolitan segregation that are only temporary. However, Black integration appears to be occurring in municipalities with large Asian and Latino presence.

Limitations and Future Analysis

This analysis has several shortcomings. First, the occurrence of racial sorting and segregation within Census tracts and within suburban municipalities is not documented. For example, Nathan Darga, head of Romeoville's Department of Planning, thinks that older blocks of Romeoville, near the municipality's historic center, have more Black and Latino residents than the average neighborhood in Romeoville. However, he believes residential diversity is generally distributed evenly throughout the municipality and not occurring at the block level (Darga 2012). Likewise, Kristi DeLaurentiis, head of Lansing's Department of Planning, notes African-Americans are settling in the southern parts of town where many White residents have left, more homes are for sale, and where there is a large portion of the municipality's rental housing (DeLaurentiis 2012). Nonetheless, current analysis can only speculate that segregation is occurring at a lower level of analysis, which is even more difficult to document in the larger census tracts of the suburbs.
Second, there are numerous limitations to segregation indices as discussed in the research design above. Social scientists have used indices to measure segregation for decades and nearly 20 different indices for racial segregation analysis exist (Echenique and Fryer, 2007). Yet, given their shortcomings, new indices of segregation should continue to be explored and evaluated. For example, Echenique and Fryer (2007) propose a “Spectral Index,” which disaggregates to the level of individuals. Furthermore, maps and municipal level analysis, two methods deployed in this paper tend to be underutilized in the segregation literature. This is partially explained by the fact that most segregation analysis focuses on regional trends and metropolitan levels of analysis. This paper hopes to encourage more local level segregation analysis and analysis within boundaries of political and social meaning.

Third, while findings show Black suburbanization in Chicago as a process of re-segregation even at levels of high household wealth, analysis has not explicitly examined the role of socioeconomic status in determining these overall findings. As the spatial assimilation model suggests, the more upwardly mobile African-Americans are the members that we should expect to achieve integration in suburban space. As such, a related topic to this thesis is the recent literature on the growth of poverty in the suburbs. Recent reports by Jargowsky (2003), Kneebone, Nadeau, and Berube (2011) and others have documented both the increases in concentration of poverty in the inner ring suburbs and the clustering of Blacks in lower income suburbs. Future analysis must control for socioeconomic disparities between African-Americans and other racial groups and draw distinctions between different suburban localities of in-migration. However, the persistent segregation of Black residents with household incomes over $75,000 (see Exhibit 9) in both the City and the suburbs suggests high levels of Black-White segregation are not explained by economic disparity alone. Moreover, previous research indicates that African-Americans with high incomes, household wealth, and educational attainment, while experiencing lower levels of segregation, remain uniquely segregated (Clark and Ware 1997, Massey and Denton, 1988, Freeman 2000).

Likewise, while findings suggest the place stratification model and the residential preference model better explain African-American suburban residential patterns in the region, analysis has not quantified the role of racial discrimination or residential preferences in determining these findings. Future analysis should examine the weight of these two explanations in suburban segregation.

Finally, analysis reveals that African-Americans in Chicago tend to be integrating in areas of
Latino and Asian presence. This finding is consistent with prior research suggesting Black segregation is lower in multiethnic metropolitan areas and that greater diversity is associated with lower levels of Black segregation (Farley and Frey, 1996; Iceland, 2002). Work by Nyden et al (1997) and Maly (2005) suggest immigration may potentially play an important role in explaining increases in neighborhood integration in Chicago. The relationship between Asian and Latino suburbanization and Black integration in Chicago’s suburbs demands further attention.

Discussion

Previous research on racial integration generally supports a spatial assimilation model where the suburbs offer a better opportunity for integration than the central city and minority access to the suburbs indicates a larger process of spatial assimilation. Yet this thesis finds Black suburbanization an exception to spatial assimilation theory.

Why has Black access to the suburbs in Chicago not resulted in larger process of residential integration? The answer to this question is well beyond the scope of this paper and, as discussed, future analysis must test the role of socioeconomic status, the growth of poor Black suburbs, racial preferences, and racial discrimination in the determining Chicago’s suburban residential patterns. However, the costs of segregation are well documented and the causes of re-segregation in Chicago’s suburbs demand further examination by academics, planners, and policymakers alike. A 2005 report by the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities concluded that segregated communities in the Chicago region had worse schools, fewer jobs, worse transportation access, stained local tax bases, and lower quality of life indicators when compared to the region as a whole.

For a discussion I frame the expansion of African-American segregation into the suburbs through four inter-related political economy “conflicts:” 1) a state enforcement conflict, 2) a principal-agent conflict, 3) a path-dependency conflict, and 4) a fragmented government conflict. These conflicts are interrelated and not exhaustive; they are simply meant to guide a discussion on how planners and policy makers can encourage residential integration.
1. **An Enforcement Problem**

One way to understand re-segregation in the suburbs is through government's inability to enforce policies. Federal and local government anti-discrimination housing legislation is ineffectively enforced by government organizations (e.g. HUD, The Illinois Housing Development Authority, and the Chicago Housing Authority) and violators are at a low risk of being prosecuted. HUD’s “Housing Discrimination Study 2000” indicates that housing discrimination remains a serious problem for African-Americans and that some illegal practices are actually on the “upswing.” For example, even though steering violates the FHA, it continues to be heavily practiced (U.S. Housing Scholars Report 2007:20). In fact, recent steering “tests” suggests the practice may be occurring in 12 percent to 15 percent of real estate transactions in the United States. Some of these enforcement problems are the result of failed institutional design. As Massey and Denton (1993: 187) note of the FHA:

*It had its enforcement provisions systematically gutted as its price of enactment. The limited enforcement authority that congress did grant under this act was interpreted narrowly by federal agencies, and the enforcement activities they did pursue were poorly funded and badly organized…. The problem with the Fair Housing Act lay not in its coverage or in the kinds of discrimination that it specifically banned but its enforcement provisions.*

HUD currently estimates that the United States has approximately 2 million Fair Housing Act violations involving racial discrimination a year (HUD Housing Discrimination Study 2000). Yet, in 2006 it processed fewer than 11,000 total complaints; that is, less than 1% of estimated fair housing act violations result in formal complaints processed by HUD. As for Chicago, in 2007 alone, 2,252 complaints were filed with private fair housing agencies (Chicago Area Fair Housing Alliance, 2008). Another example of failed enforcement comes in government agencies’ inability to investigate discrimination cases promptly. While Congress has instructed HUD to investigate housing discrimination cases within 100 days of their indictment, HUD takes 470 days on average to finish a case (Goering 2007: 253).

Often times the failures of enforcement are embedded in the agency and fragmented government problems discussed in greater detail below. For example, if an alleged victim of housing discrimination occurs within a state, like Illinois which has its own housing Act, HUD is not required to pursue the case at all. Furthermore, when HUD does pursue the case it has no constitutional authority to force compliance.

---

7 “Testing” for steering is a process in which two applicants (usually one White and one minority) with similar qualifications apply for the same residence to “test” whether the applicant receives a different level of treatment. For further discussion see the Memorandum from the Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity to All FHEO Field Staff and Office of Enforcement and Programs Staff (2003).
with the law. An investigation of fair housing complaints made to HUD, state, and municipal enforcement agencies conducted by the Governing Accounting Office concluded that "the time it takes to receive [the FHA complaint] can delay the enforcement process, potentially resulting not only in the loss of a housing opportunity but also in complainants becoming frustrated with the process and deciding not to pursue their complaint" (U.S. Housing Scholars Report 2007:20). Furthermore, government agencies are unable to prove racial discrimination in housing discrimination cases. Only 3.3 percent of all cases filed between 1989 and 2003 resulted in a “reasonable cause” determination being issued. When state and local agencies have pursued housing discrimination cases they have ruled “reasonable cause” in about 7 percent of all cases—indicating HUD is particularly unsuccessful in enforcement (U.S. Housing Scholars Report 2007:20).

Enforcement problems are equally omnipresent in the construction of affordable housing. Both Darga (2012) and Delaurentiss (2012) emphasize the importance of affordable housing and increased Black in-migration in Romeoville and Lansing, respectively. Darga suggests, “The two reasons people from all races are coming to Romeoville are that it’s the next stop on the interchange and the housing is cheap” (Darga, 2012) Likewise, Delaurentiss suggests a high amount of rental housing, almost 30% in the township, is the primary reason African-Americans are entering the community. Yet she also cites affordable housing in Indiana as one reason Whites of the same socioeconomic status are leaving (Delaurentiss 2012). In Illinois (and many other states), legislation has been enacted with the specific goal of developing affordable housing. Each municipality submits affordable housing proposals to the Illinois Housing Authority, but the state does not have the power to require the municipality to construct new units.

Lack of enforcement is partially explained by bureaucrats having considerable discretion in determining the sanctions provided by their agencies (Lipsky 2010:13). As Lipsky suggests “Rules…may be so voluminous or contradictory that they can only be enforced or invoked selectively” (2010:14). Additionally, the inability of local government agencies to process fair housing complaints and effectively pursue fair housing cases is partially a result of what Lipsky titles “The Problem of Resources” (2010:29). Lipsky notes, “Street level bureaucracies characteristically provide fewer resources than necessary for workers to do their jobs adequately” 2010:29). The U.S. Scholars Report on Residential Segregation and Housing Discrimination notes that funding for HUD’s Office of Federal Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (FHEO) has not kept pace with inflation and staff levels are well below those required to resolve housing complaints.
effectively (U. S Scholars Report 2007).

2. A Principal-Agent Problem

A second way to understand re-segregation is through the principal agent literature. Principal agent problems are embedded in a more general “agency theory.” Agency theory, where the individual is the unit of analysis, tries to account for and avoid conflicts between principals and agents, identify agency costs, and explore alternative governance mechanisms and incentives to reduce and ensure maximal alignment of the principals’ and agents’ interests (Alexander 2005: 219). In its simplest construction, a principal agent conflict arises when the principal and its agent have different goals (Eisenhardt 1989).

In the case of residential re-segregation the principal is the Federal Government (e.g. congress) with legislation to prevent discriminatory housing practices (e.g. the FHA) and the agent is HUD who pursues programs against this agenda. The conflict is replicated at the local scale, where federal, state, and local, governments are the principals and local housing agencies (e.g. The Chicago Housing Authority or the Illinois Development Authority) are the agents.

The principal agent problem goes hand-in-hand with the enforcement problem discussed above and the problem of fragmented government discussed below. Congress doesn’t always have the information or resources to know if agencies are acting on their behalf. As Sant’Abrogio suggests, “due to limitations on Congress’s ability to monitor and control agency action, there is always a risk of agency drift in which the agency’s actions diverge from the policy preferences of the congressional enacting coalition” (1389:2011). Along with being gutted of its enforcement provisions the FHA has been served by agents working against legislative intention. In fact, Congress recognized institutional racism within HUD even before it passed the FHA (Massey and Denton 1993:204). Massey and Denton argue, “The lack of agency commitment left a large ‘administrative gap’ between the affirmative duty imposed on HUD by Congress and the agency’s actual policies and preferences” (1993: 205).

On the local level, agency actions have also run counter to congressional legislation. In 2005 the CHA settled a lawsuit against hundreds of former public housing residents (Wallace v. Chicago Housing Authority). The CHA was accused of not providing relocation services for ex-residents or steering

---

8 Principal agent problems are often also concerned with risk aversion of the agent. If the agent is not risk averse the principal–agent problem can often be solved more easily. However conflicting goals, not risk aversion, is the focus of this conflict. For more information on risk aversion see Eisenhardt (1989).
past residents into racially and economically segregated neighborhoods. The settlement re-configured the CHA's relocation policy but the CHA still has discretion to change existing or future programs.

Principal-agency problems also exist where HUD serves as the principal and local housing authorities as its agents. Joseph Shuldiner, reflects on his days as Assistant Secretary at HUD when HUD took over the CHA in 1996:

*The [CHA] was totally dysfunctional. Its own auditors had given the audit a disclaimer that they could not rely on the data supplied by the CHA. As bad as the public housing was, the Section 8 voucher program was worse. Families had been on the voucher waiting list for twenty years, almost since the program was created in 1976. Files were in neither alphabetical, chronological, nor any other order. (Interview: March 2010)*

3. A Fragmented Government Problem

The Schelling model of neighborhood preferences (discussed in the literature review) doesn't function without local jurisdictions to sort preferences. As Weiher (1991:21) suggests:

*Neighborhood tipping models...are predicated on the existence of discrete spatial units. Absent of a clearly defined and accessible boundary, the [Schelling tipping] model becomes nonsense, as there are no bases for assigning racial identities to one place or another, and hence no criteria to moving or staying put.*

Tiebout's “Theory of Local Economic Expenditures,” further elucidates this conflict. Tiebout argues that the existence of multiple jurisdictions solves the key problem in the provision of public goods (e.g. unwillingness to reveal true preferences and free riding). Fragmented structures of local governance may encourage households to “vote with their feet” and sort into communities based on their willingness to pay for local public goods and services. Therefore, if the demand for public goods or service varies by race or if households have a preference for specific racial characteristics, local government fragmentation may lead to increased residential segregation by race across neighborhoods (Dawkins 2005). While the suburbs have often been described as distinguishable from the central city, suburbs themselves have a great deal of demographic variety and tend to be spatially and jurisdictionally distinct (Weiher 1991:8). Therefore increased Black outmigration from the central city to the suburbs does not change this dynamic.

The Schelling and Tiebout models better explain involuntary segregation within a fragmented government. Yet, political boundaries can be used for voluntary segregation as well. Described as, “politics of exclusion,” communities use political boundaries to block those of lower income and minority status
(Logan and Schneider 1984, Logan 1987, Norton 1979, Weiher 1991). Hirschman's options of “Exit, Voice, and Loyalty” depend upon the availability and quality of alternatives. If some jurisdictions block entrance this subsequently limits the ability of residents in other jurisdictions to use “Exit.” Municipal Incorporation gives community’s autonomy over land use and construction. For example, local governments can prohibit multi-unit dwellings to block lower income families and municipalities can manipulate housing and welfare programs to block Black residents. In the case of re-segregation, Blacks clearly have some power of “Exit” as they move from the City to the suburbs. But “Exit” is limited to certain alternatives—i.e. mainly suburbs with other Black residents.

Given community turnover, exclusion alone cannot account for the perseverance of homogenous communities (Downs 1981:25) and a process of selection must complement exclusion (Weiher 1991:14). For example, realtors practice exclusion by steering but they also recruit certain racial and socioeconomic characteristics they see suitable for a particular jurisdiction (Judd 1979). Indeed a weakness in the Tiebout model (and its second assumption) is that “Consumer voters…have full knowledge of differences among revenue and expenditure patterns (419). In reality, citizens are not aware of all local governments and their service/public good provisions. Recruitment and competition for “desired residents,” often via provision of information to movers, matches residents to jurisdictions that have racial or economic preferences—contributeing to segregation. Delaurentiis (2012) suggests that residents leaving Lansing (e.g. White residents) are being recruited by realtors in the near Chicago suburbs of Indiana. Thus, while federalism may have been designed to protect the rights of citizens, many counter that pluralism rewards those who already have resources, entrenches power with majorities at the local level, and therefore results in a system of segregated inequality (Weiher 1991).

4. **A Path Dependency Problem**

A final way to frame continued racial re-segregation in the suburbs is through a framework of path dependency. Path dependency is a conflict of continuing down the old path (in this case segregation) versus moving to a superior alternative path (i.e. integration). In its most general sense it simply tells us “history matters” (Pierson 2000:252). According to North (1990:98) path dependence means: The process by which we arrive at today’s institutions is relevant and constrains future choices…[rather
than being] a story of inevitability in which the past neatly predicts the future [it is] a way to narrow conceptually the choice set and link decision making through time.  

Plateau (1994: 787) further elucidates this definition: “Owing to complex interrelations between political, social, and economic factors, once a specific arrangement emerges it may become part of a self-enforcing stable system.…” Path dependency is often used in the political economy jargon of economic development, particularly to describe the inability of certain markets to replicate others (see authors above). But it is equally compelling when thinking about the production and reproduction of segregated space. While government polices at the federal and local level have attempted to constrain past patterns of segregation, prior government actions, inveterate real estate practices, and ingrained racial prejudice affect Black settlement patterns today. In fact, Darga (2012) suggests that Romeoville has experienced racial integration simply because it isn’t located directly to the south of the city and doesn’t have a history associated with Chicago’s South Side and the Black Belt. He notes:

People have an image of what the South Side [of Chicago] is and the perception is negative. You might call it fear. Romeoville doesn’t have that, or it doesn’t have as much of it. I’m sure there is some racial fear here, but people don’t equate this area with their negative perception of the South Side.

Path dependency is explained not only by the persistent deployment of inequality in space by Whites (e.g. steering), but also by Black efforts to overcome it. As discussed, African-Americans were part of America’s early decentralization process and established suburbs “of their own.” Weiss (2004: 5). Weiss (2004: 5) reminds us that “historians have done a better job excluding African-Americans from the suburbs than even White suburbanites.” However, the African-American suburban landscape has also been ignored in segregation literature and analysis. The maps in exhibits 12 and 13 well reveal paths of migration where American suburbanization from 2000 to 2010 is a continuation of past African-American migrations to the suburbs dating back to at least the 1970s. Suburbanization after Civil Rights legislation has replicated earlier patterns; early Black suburbanites maintained social relations with Blacks in the City and through information and experiences, passed a long via Black social networks, particular suburbs became recognized landmarks in the mental geography of African-Americans (Weiss 116: 2004). Indeed, African-American communities are embedded in larger social systems and communities are linked to one another through established paths of migration and interpersonal networks (Sampson 2012).

Thus, re-segregation is not the result of a single defining moment. Rather, racist White practices

---

9 Quoted from Plateau (1994).
and the movement of Blacks to Black suburbs has been reproduced and continually entrenched over time. As Plateau suggests, path dependency has become a re-enforcing system; as segregation continues, the costs of switching to integration continues to rise. While African-Americans looking to move to the suburbs may prefer to live in White neighborhoods, more Black families in the suburbs leads to more information about these Black suburbs and not others (i.e. increasing returns over time for the old path).

Furthermore, the consequences of segregation, like lack of access to education and exacerbation of poverty, continue to increase inequality and thus raise the costs to integration. Tilly (1996) suggests, “Past social relations and their residues-material, ideological, and otherwise constrain present social relations” (116). Seittle (1996) notes:

As residential segregation further permeates our society, the prospects of improving race relations in America continue to dwindle. Physical distance between different racial communities perpetuates social distance. Residential segregation becomes…the perpetuating cause of racial distrust and ignorance.

5. Planning and Policy Implications

These frameworks offer some insight into how the local and Federal planning and policy officials can better achieve levels of integration. First, segregation is not simply resolved by the passage of judicial law and congressional legislation. Federal, state, and local governments must establish new mechanisms of enforcement to combat discriminatory practices. As Massey and Denton argued two decades ago, HUD and the Attorney General must “throw their full institutional weight into locating instances of housing discrimination and bringing those who violate the Fair Housing Act to justice (1993:218). Furthermore, resources to combat illegal housing practices must be increased. The FHEO and CHA, for example, are routinely underfunded. But, given the principal-agency problems identified, the state of Illinois should take an active role in funding private housing organizations that enforce fair housing.

Second, Illinois and other state governments should look for ways to counter the conflict of multiple municipal governments and segregation. All states level governments should a) create limits on municipal land use laws that block affordable housing and b) create mandates such that all municipalities are required to dedicate a certain amount of their land to affordable housing. Furthermore, all municipal level governments should mandate the Illinois Housing Authority to build housing in White neighbor-

10 For a discussion on the difficulty of implementing land use policy at the national level see Plotkin (1980).
hoods. This should be accompanied by what have been titled “mobility” programs or “Move to Opportunity” (MTO) programs where minorities who face discrimination in their search for affordable housing are provided with vouchers to move into non-segregated affordable housing (Seitels 1996).  

Finally, a path dependency framework indicates academics, planners, and policy makers may be looking in the wrong places to encourage integration. As Maly (2005) notes “a specific set of government policies for urban neighborhoods and suburbs to implement is too simplistic” (Maly 2005:316). Recent work by Nyden, Lukeheart, and Maly (1998), Ellen (2000) and Maly (2005) suggest neighborhood integration is more likely when there are strong community based organizations, when social institutions are committed to maintaining diversity and promoting cross-race dialogue, and when residents are aware of the value of diversity (Charles 1993:201). Integration deserves the analytic attention segregation has received and these authors offer possible entrance points to begin such a dialogue.

---

11 Mobility Programs have not had the transformative effects many policy makers intended. However, most residents who have participated in these programs, like (MTO), have moved into neighborhoods with only slightly lower levels of poverty and segregation. To date, the MTO results are mixed. For further discussion see Sampson (2012). Mobility programs have also faced many implementation hurdles in the past. For example, landlords often illegally refuse to rent to Section 8 voucher holders. For further discussion see Seitels (1996).
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APPENDIX

Interview Questions Romeoville, Illinois

1. What explains this entrance of households? Why are new residents locating in this suburb?

2. What makes this suburb more attractive to new residents than other suburbs?

3. Why are new resident moving to this suburb as opposed to other suburbs next door?

4. Are many new residents coming for employment? Housing? Schools?

5. How do you think new residents heard of this suburb?

6. What do you think this suburb offers for new residents that old locations of residence failed to offer?

7. Are many new residents coming from the City? From other suburbs?

8. Are new residents spreading evenly through this suburb?

9. Where are new residents locating in this suburb? Is there a particular area where new residents are locating?

10. Are different ethnicities spreading evenly through this suburb?

11. Where are African-Americans locating in this suburb? Where are Caucasians locating in this suburb? Where are Latinos locating in the suburb?

12. Why are_________ locating in this particular area of the suburb?

13. Has the recent demographic change had any effect on your public services? Schools? Transportation? Housing market?

14. Has there been racial turnover in any particular parts of your community?

15. How has the community responded to diversity? Does this community pride itself on diversity? In what ways does this community value diversity?

16. Are there community based organizations or social institutions committed to maintaining diversity or promoting cross race dialogue?
Interview Questions Lansing, Illinois

1. What explains this exodus of white households?

2. Why are some residents leaving this community? For employment? Housing? Schools?

3. What about this community has become less attractive to the people leaving? What is more attractive about the new places they are moving to?

4. Are there certain areas within the suburb that people are leaving? Why are they leaving these particular areas?

5. Where are people going to? Nearby suburbs? Other suburbs? To the City? Out of the region?

6. What explains this entrance of black households?

7. Why are black residents coming to this suburb? For employment? Housing? Schools?

8. Where are new residents locating in this suburb? Is there a particular location where new residents are locating?

9. Why are they locating in this particular area of the suburb?

10. What makes this suburb more attractive to new residents than other suburbs?

11. Why are new residents moving to this suburb as opposed to suburb Z next door?

12. How do you believe new residents heard of this suburb?

13. Are many new residents coming from the City? From nearby suburbs?

14. What do you think this suburb offers for new residents that old locations of residence failed to offer?

15. How has the community responded this demographic shift? How has the planning department responded to this demographic change?

16. Are there community based organizations or social institutions committed to maintaining diversity or promoting cross race dialogue?
Seven County Chicago MSA:
Dot Density by Race 1980
by Census tract

Exhibit 18 A: Chicago MSA Dot Density Maps of Where Residents are Living (Full Size), 1980
Seven County Chicago MSA:
Dot Density by Race in 2010
by Census tract

Exhibit 18 D: Chicago MSA Dot Density Maps of Where Residents are Living (Full Size), 2010
Seven County Chicago MSA:
by Census tract
Seven County Chicago MSA:
Dot Density by Population Gain 1980 - 1990
by Census tract

Seven County Chicago MSA: Dot Density by Population Gain 1980-1990 by Census tract

Seven County Chicago MSA:
Percentage African-American in 1970
by Census tract

Exhibit 14: Chicago MSA African-American Concentration Maps, 1970
Seven County Chicago MSA:
Percentage African-American in 1980
by Census tract

Exhibit 14: Chicago MSA African-American Concentration Maps, 1980
Seven County Chicago MSA: Percentage African-American in 1990 by Census tract

Exhibit 14: Chicago MSA African-American Concentration Maps, 1990
Exhibit 14: Chicago MSA African-American Concentration Maps, 2000
Seven County Chicago MSA: Percentage African-American in 2010 by Census tract

Exhibit 14: Chicago MSA African-American Concentration Maps, 2010