Racial and Ethnic Residential Segregation and Household Structure: A Research Note[*]

John Iceland,
Penn State University

Kimberly A. Goyette,
Temple University

Kyle Anne Nelson, and
University of Maryland

Chaowen Chan
University of Maryland

Abstract

This study examines how patterns of racial and ethnic segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas vary by household structure. Specifically, using tract-level summary files from the 2000 decennial census, we estimated levels of metropolitan segregation for different racial and ethnic groups by household composition and poverty status. We find that when using the dissimilarity index, white households with children, and especially poor ones, are more segregated from black, Hispanic, and Asian households than are white households as a whole. Results from the interaction index provide complimentary information. In large part because nonpoor white married-couple households are more numerous than other groups in most metropolitan areas, such households tend to have relatively less interaction with other racial and ethnic groups, and black and Hispanic households in particular. In contrast, minority group members often live in neighborhoods with a high proportion of non-Hispanic white households. Among all three minority group families with children, nonpoor married householders had the highest levels of interaction with whites. These results show that household structure shapes racial and ethnic residential patterns in U.S. metropolitan areas.

Keywords

racial and ethnic residential segregation; racial and ethnic inequality; household structure

Black-white residential segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas, while still high in absolute terms, has declined substantially over the past few decades. This suggests at least some easing of the stark racial divide between blacks and whites in American life. However, this decline may be less dramatic for some groups within these populations. For example, some research has indicated that black and white children in schools and neighborhoods are more segregated than blacks and whites overall (Logan et al. 2001; Logan 2004). In addition, research on neighborhood change suggests that white households with children are amongst the least likely to live in integrated neighborhoods (Ellen 2007).

Researchers have long noted that life course considerations play an important role in household residential decisions, as residential mobility is often a response to housing needs that accompany changes in household composition (Rossi 1955; Speare, Goldstein, and Frey 1975). For example, married couples may desire more space than single individuals. In addition to space, families with children are also likely concerned about particular kinds of neighborhood amenities, such as good schools, parks, and safe spaces (Rosenbaum and Friedman 2001). The implication is that white households with children may be especially averse to minority neighborhoods because of the perception (whether unfounded or not) that such neighborhoods have fewer amenities, higher crime, or inferior public schools (Harris 1997; Ellen 2007).

Despite these suggestive findings that household structure influences patterns of racial and ethnic residential segregation, there are relatively few studies to date that directly focus on this issue. The goal of our study is to therefore provide a detailed, mainly descriptive, analysis of how racial and ethnic residential segregation varies by household structure in U.S. metropolitan areas. The following questions guide our analysis: To what extent are households with children, and particularly white households with children, more racially and ethnically residentially segregated than other kinds of households, such as non-family households? Does household composition play a different role in the segregation of white households from others than it does in the segregation of black, Hispanic, and Asian households? Do socioeconomic status and marital status of the householder also play a role in shaping these patterns?

To answer these questions we use data from the 2000 decennial census and calculate different measures of residential segregation in all metropolitan areas where various groups are present in sufficient numbers. We examine the segregation of whites, blacks, Asians, and Hispanics from alternative reference groups and calculate levels of segregation by household poverty status and the marital status of the householder. In doing so, we aim to get a better sense of not only the role that race plays in shaping residential patterns, but how race interacts with household composition in producing the levels of racial and ethnic segregation we see today.

Background

Black-white segregation in American metropolitan areas remains quite pervasive, though it has declined significantly over the past few decades. Hispanic-white and Asian-white segregation levels are lower than black-white ones, though they did not decline in the same

fashion over the same time period, in large part due to continued immigration that is reinforcing immigrant enclaves (Iceland 2009; Iceland and Scopilliti 2008; Iceland and Nelson 2008).

A number of theories have been offered to explain these patterns of racial and ethnic residential segregation in the U.S. Two broad perspectives that encompass many of these views have been termed spatial assimilation and place stratification. According to the spatial assimilation model, differences in socioeconomic status (SES) and, among immigrants groups, acculturation, shape patterns of segregation. Minority members may simply not be able to afford to live in the same neighborhoods as more affluent whites. Indeed, research has shown that people of different classes are segregated from one another, even if only moderately so (Clark 2007; Fischer et al. 2004; Iceland, Sharpe and Steinmetz 2005; Iceland and Wilkes 2006).

In contrast to the spatial assimilation model, the place stratification perspective emphasizes the role of prejudice and discrimination in shaping residential patterns. Segregation is the tool used by whites to maintain social distance from other minority groups. The effects of structural barriers are thought to be greatest for blacks in the U.S. because blacks have historically been perceived in the most unfavorable terms (Bobo and Zubrinksky 1996; Charles 2000). Despite some declines in discrimination in recent years, many believe that both it and white avoidance of mixed or minority neighborhoods still play central roles in shaping the residential patterns of various ethnic groups in the United States (Charles 2005; Squires and Kurbin 2006; Ross and Turner 2005).

While these two general approaches to racial and ethnic residential segregation address its underlying social causes, they say little about how these larger mechanisms are manifested differently in residential patterns according to household structure.

Household Composition

Though research has explored how household composition and life course factors such as age, marital status, and the presence of children affect one's propensity to move (e.g. Landale and Guest 1985; Rossi 1955; Speare, Goldstein, and Frey 1975), the residential segregation literature is thin in its discussion of how these considerations affect racial and ethnic residential patterns. There are at least two reasons to believe that household composition may affect black and white residential decisions differently. First, white (and perhaps Asian) households may avoid minority neighborhoods out of concern for their children. Second, white and Asian married couple households with children tend to be the most affluent and thus able to avoid neighborhoods that they perceive to be less desirable.

Regarding the first explanation, some literature suggests that white parents may avoid neighborhoods with a greater proportion of minority families, and black families in particular. This could be due not only to prejudice, or "racial reasons" for residential segregation, as Krysan (2002) refers to them, but also to beliefs (real or imagined) about school quality and safety associated with the racial composition of areas—what Krysan (2002) terms "race-associated" reasons. Harris (1997, 1999, 2001) terms these "race-proxy" reasons. In contrast, non-family households may care less about these kinds of neighborhood

amenities and may be more open to living in more diverse areas often in and around the urban core.

The second reason why household composition may interact differently with residential decisions for white and black households relates to socioeconomic differences by race and household composition. Generally speaking, socioeconomic status may enable more white and Asian families to act on their preferences for particular types of schools and other neighborhood amenities (Holme 2002). Because white and Asian families with children, particularly those headed by a married couple, are generally of higher socioeconomic status than other types of households, they may be the most likely to be able to afford to live in neighborhoods with the most amenities. These neighborhoods are typically higher-cost, less diverse suburban settings, given the considerable racial and ethnic socioeconomic differentials in the U.S. Conversely, black and Hispanic families, which are more likely to be headed by lower-income single parents, tend to be less able to afford to live in high amenity neighborhoods (Johnson 2006; Ellen 2007).

The two explanations offer alternative hypotheses on residential patterns. According to the first model, White (and perhaps Asian) family households with children may avoid more integrated neighborhoods due to either prejudice (racial factors) or notions of neighborhood quality associated with race ("racial proxy" factors). If this is the case, white and Asian households with children will display higher levels of segregation from black and Hispanic group members than other white and Asian households even after controlling for income.

According to the second model, household structure in and of itself does not influence residential preferences. Rather, it is mainly that more white and Asian family households have higher incomes that enable them to live in more affluent and less diverse areas than black and Hispanic households. According to this perspective, we expect to find that, controlling for income, racial and ethnic segregation patterns will not vary by household type.

Our analysis builds on existing studies in a few important ways. First, unlike most of them, we focus on the *interaction* between race and household composition. Second, most previous studies focus on segregation or mobility patterns in a white-black context. We show how segregation patterns differ when alternative racial and ethnic reference groups are considered, including Hispanic and Asian households. Third, unlike many previous studies, we pay close attention to the potential mediating role of poverty in shaping residential patterns, given differences in the prevalence of poverty across racial and ethnic groups in the U.S.

Data and Methods

We use Summary File (SF) 3 data from the 2000 Census to examine the residential patterns of households by race and household composition across neighborhoods in U.S. metropolitan areas. Our analyses consist of a series of cross-tabulations showing the association between race/ethnicity, household structure, and patterns of residential segregation. First, we calculate segregation indexes for all households by race and Hispanic origin. Then we calculate indexes for different household types: married-couple households

with children, single parent households with children, and non-family households.[1] A final key computation is segregation by household composition and poverty status. These comparisons will allow us to examine: 1) net differences in racial and ethnic segregation by household composition and 2) whether differences in poverty status help explain any of these differences.

Households are classified by the race/ethnicity of the householder. Based on these questions and the data available in SF 3 tabulations, we examine the segregation of 4 different racial/ethnic groups: those who marked that they were non-Hispanic white alone, black alone, Asian alone, and Hispanic (who can be of any race). Segregation indexes are computed for groups that have at least 1,000 in a particular metropolitan area—as segregation indexes for small populations are less reliable than those with larger ones (Iceland, Weinberg, and Steinmetz 2002). Our analyses include only counts of households and thus exclude people in group quarters (such as prisons, dorms, or other kinds of group houses). We present segregation estimates averaged across metropolitan statistical areas (MSAs), primary metropolitan statistical areas (PMSAs), and for New England states, New England county metropolitan areas (NECMAs) together referred to hereafter as metropolitan areas (MAs), as defined by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) on June 30, 1999. Using this definition, there are 318 MAs in the U.S. To examine the distribution of different groups across neighborhoods within metropolitan areas, we use census tracts, which have, on average, 4,000 people.

Though we computed three measures of residential segregation—dissimilarity, interaction, and information theory (or entropy)—we present results for just two: dissimilarity and interaction. Residential patterns are quite similar when using dissimilarity and information theory because they are both measures of evenness. The dissimilarity index has the property of not being sensitive to the relative size of the groups in question. It merely provides information on how evenly members of groups are distributed across neighborhoods. In contrast, the interaction index is sensitive to the relative size of the groups being studied. Other factors being equal, larger groups will have lower interaction scores than smaller ones simply because there are fewer other-group members present with which to share neighborhoods.

Limitations

Several limitations of our analyses are worth noting. First, the analysis is largely descriptive, as it consists of presenting patterns of residential segregation by race/ethnicity, household type, and poverty status. With the neighborhood-level data available, we simply cannot look at the role that additional variables (such as alternative socioeconomic status indicators) may play in shaping different groups' residential patterns. Poverty is a somewhat blunt measurement tool, as are some of our household indicators. Second, the cross-sectional nature of the data imposes limitations on claims of causality—we are mainly examining general relationships between variables. Third, due to data limitations, we cannot look at

---

[1]We also examined whether the ages of children in the household were associated with residential patterns by comparing households that had children less than 5 years only vs. children 5 to 17 years old only. However, there were only minimal differences by age of children.

neighborhood-level residential patterns of mixed-race households by household composition and poverty status. In addition, while SF 3 data have relevant detailed population counts for non-Hispanic white householders, the black and Asian counts include those who are non-Hispanic and Hispanic. This overlap means that we do not compute levels of segregation between Hispanics and blacks or Asians because it is inappropriate to include duplicate counts of households in the two groups being compared in a segregation index.

Despite these limitations, we believe this analysis will provide an important baseline of descriptive information about the racial and ethnic residential patterns of different kinds of households. The existing literature is extraordinarily thin in this area. We hope that our effort will spur further research in this area.

Results

Table 1 shows residential segregation patterns of non-Hispanic white households from black, Hispanic, and Asian households using the dissimilarity index. For each reference group (i.e., column) calculation, we use a constant set of metropolitan areas where all groups are present in sufficient numbers (at least 1,000 group members). We do this to ensure that differences in mean segregation scores across different household types are not merely a function of different sets of metropolitan areas being captured in the calculations.[2]

In table 1 we see that the overall unweighted dissimilarity score between black and white households is 0.600 in the 121 metropolitan areas where there were over 1,000 people in each group shown. As a rule of thumb, D scores below 0.3 are low, from 0.3 to 0.6 are moderate, and above 0.6 are high. The table shows considerable variation by household type. The dissimilarity between white married-couple households with children and all blacks is 0.657, and the scores are high regardless of the poverty status of the white married-couple household.[3]

The second set of columns shows black-white segregation among households of the same composition and poverty status. This column includes a more restricted set of metropolitan areas— 37 in which there were over 1,000 blacks and whites of all the household/poverty status groups shown. Among these, we first see that overall black-white segregation is nominally higher (0.634) than the score in the first column (though the difference is not statistically significant in this case, as the number of metropolitan areas under consideration

---

[2]We chose not to have a constant set of metropolitan areas for the entire table (or all of the tables in the paper) because we are most interested in making comparisons in segregation scores within columns (i.e., the role of household structure and poverty by reference group). In addition, restricting the number of metropolitan areas to the smallest cell in an entire table ends up confining the analysis to a very small number of metropolitan areas that are hardly representative of the contexts in which all groups reside.

[3]One set of findings not shown in the table indicates that the dissimilarity between white married-couples without children and blacks is only nominally (not statistically significantly) lower than the figure for white married couples with children. In a constant set of metropolitan areas where all of these groups are present in sufficient numbers, the corresponding D scores are 0.664 for married couples with children and 0.647 for couples without. Why are married couples without children more similar to married couples with children than to non-family households? With the data available it is difficult to say, though the literature reviewed in the background section suggests at least three explanations. Married couples without children may resemble married couples with children in: 1) either their anticipation of having children shortly or having had children in the past that are no long present; 2) incomes; 3) residential preferences for neighbors of different races and incomes. We do not include results for married-couple households without children in any of the tables because such families tend to fairly closely resemble married-couple households with children, and because their inclusion considerably reduces the sample size of metropolitan areas in the tables. We include some discussion on this general issue in the paper's conclusion.

is fairly small), consistent with previous literature indicating that larger metropolitan areas in the U.S. (those where there are large numbers of black and whites of all household types) generally have higher levels of segregation than smaller ones (Iceland, Weinberg, and Steinmetz 2002). The dissimilarity scores in this column also show that poor white married-couple households with children are especially highly segregated from poor black married-couple households with children (0.796). In contrast, among nonpoor white and black married-couple households with children, the D score, while quite high, is nevertheless substantially lower (0.641). Among single-parent households with children, levels of segregation are quite high, though again poor households are more segregated from each other (0.730) than nonpoor ones (0.673). These numbers all suggest that SES—or at least poverty status—is at least moderately related with residential patterns: nonpoor white and black households are considerably less segregated from each other than poor white and black households.

The next set of columns show Hispanic-white segregation scores. Overall white-Hispanic segregation (0.435) is lower than white-black segregation (0.600). The segregation of white married-couple households with children from Hispanics (0.505) is higher than the overall white-Hispanic score. Poor white married-couple households with children show among the highest levels of segregation from Hispanics (0.567), and indeed of Hispanics of the same household composition and poverty status (0.730). Whites living in non-family households show quite moderate levels of segregation from Hispanics in general (0.411) and Hispanic non-family households (0.420). Here again poverty status makes a difference, with nonpoor white households being less segregated from Hispanics than poor white households.

The final set of columns with Asians as the reference group shows similar patterns to those which use Hispanics as the reference group. Asian-white segregation is significantly higher among married-couple households with children (0.480) than all households (0.438), though this difference is moderate. Differences by poverty status are more striking, where the D between poor white married-couple households with children and all Asian households (0.631) is higher than D among nonpoor white married-couple households with children (0.481). The segregation of poor white and Asian single-parent households in the 13 metropolitan areas where they are both present in sufficient numbers is very high (0.802).

We conducted further analyses examining the segregation of black households from Asian households (available upon request). Overall levels of dissimilarity between these groups are moderate to high (0.545) in the 15 metropolitan areas where blacks and all Asian subgroups are present in sufficient numbers. Patterns by household composition and poverty status are fairly similar to what we see among whites and blacks, in that Asian married-couple households with children (0.592), and especially poor ones (0.716), are highly segregated from blacks. Poor Asian and poor black households are extremely segregated from each other (0.827 and 0.823 among married and single-parent households, respectively).

Table 2 shows interaction scores for non-Hispanic white households of various types and by poverty status. It has the same structure as Table 1, but highlights a different dimension of segregation: exposure. As described earlier, interaction scores indicate the average proportion of reference group members in the neighborhood where the typical individual of

the group of interest resides. Other factors being equal, large demographic groups will tend to have lower interaction scores, because of the smaller risk set of other groups in a metropolitan area.

According to results in Table 2, the typical white household lives in a neighborhood where 6.8 percent of the households have a black householder. This proportion is a little higher in the more restricted set of 37 metropolitan areas (10.5 percent) which tend to have larger black populations. In the first set of columns in table 2 we see that poor married-couple white households actually tend to live in neighborhoods with more blacks (0.081) than nonpoor married-couple households (0.056). This pattern by poverty status holds among white single-parent households as well. Thus, despite lower levels of dissimilarity (shown in table 1), nonpoor white households, in part because they are a demographically large group, live in neighborhoods with relatively few households that include blacks.

The middle columns in table 2 indicate that different types of non-Hispanic white households show somewhat similar levels and patterns of interaction with Hispanic households. Nonpoor married non-Hispanic white households, for example, have moderately lower levels of interaction (0.059) with all Hispanic households than poor non-Hispanic white households of the same composition (0.082), but again poor white households tend to have particularly low levels of interaction with poor Hispanic households of the same composition.

Levels of interaction with Asian households are on the whole considerably lower (0.025), though a little higher in the more restricted set of metropolitan areas (0.072) that tend to have a higher proportion of Asians than the broader set of metropolitan areas. When all Asians are the reference group, there is very little variation in interaction by household type and poverty status of the white householder. When comparing households of the same composition and poverty status, the highest levels of interaction occur among nonpoor married-couple households.

Table 3 shows the interaction index of Black households with non-Hispanic white and Asian households. Among other things, the table, when compared with results in table 2, illustrates the asymmetrical properties of the interaction index. We see the black interaction is considerably higher with non-Hispanic whites (0.358) than vice-versa (the 0.068 figure from table 2). That is, in large part due to the demographic composition of metropolitan areas, the typical African American lives in a neighborhood with a considerably higher proportion of whites than the typical white individual with African Americans. The table further shows that black married-couple households (0.387) have higher levels of interaction with white households than black single-parent households (0.288). When looking at interaction scores for households of the same composition and poverty status, nonpoor married-couple (0.135) and non-family households (0.161) have relatively high levels of interactions with whites. Levels of interaction with Asians are on the whole low, and the variation by household type and poverty status are rather small. Levels of interaction are again highest among nonpoor married-couple households.

Table 4 shows the interaction index for Asian households, where non-Hispanic whites and blacks are the reference groups. Here we see very high levels of interaction with non-Hispanic white households (0.554). Interaction is relatively high among nonpoor married-couple Asian households (0.525) and non-family households (0.570), and lower for poor married-couple (0.384) and poor single-parent (0.387) households. These general patterns hold when looking at households of the same composition and poverty status, though overall interaction levels are lower (in large part due to smaller demographic groups in the risk sets).

Patterns in Asian-black interaction tend to be similar to those observed between whites and blacks. The overall interaction score between Asian and black households is low (0.080). As among whites, we also find nominally higher levels of Asian-black interaction among poor Asian households than non-poor ones, though these differences are not statistically significant, in part due to the relatively small number of metropolitan areas in the sample (15).

Finally, Table 5 shows the interaction between Hispanics and non-Hispanic whites. Overall levels are fairly high (0.494), suggesting that about half the residents are white in the neighborhood where the typical Hispanic lives. Interaction with whites is relatively high among nonpoor married-couple households and non-family households, and lower among poor households (both married-couple and single-parent). Comparing those of the same household composition/poverty status (the final column), interaction is relatively high among nonpoor married-couple Hispanic and white households, as well as non-family ones.

Conclusion

The goal of this analysis has been to examine the relationship between household composition and racial and ethnic residential segregation. Using tract-level summary files from the 2000 decennial census, we estimated levels of metropolitan segregation, as represented by the dissimilarity and interaction indexes, for different groups. Dissimilarity and interaction provide complementary pieces of information about the residential patterns of these groups because they tap into different dimensions of segregation: evenness and exposure. We find that when using the dissimilarity index, white households with children are indeed more segregated from black, Hispanic, and Asian households than white households as a whole. Poor white households tend to display the highest levels of dissimilarity, particularly with corresponding poor households of other racial and ethnic groups.

The interaction index tells a different, complementary, story. In large part reflecting the relative demographic dominance of nonpoor white married-couple households in many metropolitan areas, such households tended to have somewhat limited "interaction" with other groups, and blacks and Hispanics in particular. For example, the typical nonpoor white married-couple householder in 2000 lived in a neighborhood that was 6 percent black, 6 percent Hispanic, and another 3 percent Asian. The typical *poor* white married-couple household actually lived in slightly more diverse neighborhoods, where, on average, 8

percent of the households were black, 8 percent were Hispanic, and another 3 percent were Asian.

Also reflecting the demographic dominance of whites in U.S. metropolitan areas, we found that minority group members often lived in neighborhoods with a relatively high proportion of non-Hispanic white households. The typical black, Asian, and Hispanic householder lived in neighborhoods that were, on average, 36 percent, 55 percent, and 49 percent non-Hispanic white, respectively. Among all three minority group households with children, nonpoor married householders tended to have the highest levels of interaction with whites.

Our data are limited in that the descriptive information they provide cannot allow us to judge which among several competing explanations best accounts for the differences in residential segregation patterns between households with and without children. However, we can draw some tentative conclusions. First, differences in socioeconomic status do not explain differences in segregation patterns by household composition among whites. Both nonpoor and poor white family households were more segregated from blacks than non-family households.

Nevertheless, socioeconomic status still influences patterns of segregation. Perhaps contrary to common perception, poor white and Asian households with children are more segregated from blacks than similar nonpoor white and Asian households when using the dissimilarity index, though poor white households do live in neighborhoods with a slightly higher proportion of minorities. This suggests that nonpoor white households, because of their demographic dominance and higher incomes are, so to speak, less at "risk" of living in neighborhoods with many minority group members (poor African Americans and Hispanics in particular) than poor white households. It could be that there is greater "effort" among poor whites to avoid minority group members to achieve a desired neighborhood racial/ ethnic mix.

Conversely, nonpoor black, Hispanic, and Asian households with children live in neighborhoods with a higher proportion of whites than poor black, Hispanic, and Asian family households. These minority families with children may seek the better neighborhood schools and amenities of neighborhoods in which more whites live. Nonpoor families are more likely to be able to afford to live in these neighborhoods, and thus use their resources to "buy into" the schools and services in neighborhoods with more whites. A third tentative conclusion, then, is that socioeconomic status matters somewhat differently for the choices of white families with children compared to Hispanic and black families with children.

The higher racial and ethnic segregation of white married-couple families with children from other groups than non-family households suggests that having children matters. However, analyses that looked at white married couple families without children, and others that compared households by age of the children (not shown), found that these factors played, at most, small roles in segregation patterns. This suggests that life course factors associated with the presence of young children do *not* account for why children influence patterns of residential racial and ethnic segregation. It could be that white families with and without children are relatively similar to each other (at least as compared with non-family

households) in a number of ways, such as in their incomes and neighborhood preferences. Many of the married couples without children may also either anticipate having children shortly or may have had their children move out before the survey. With the data available, we cannot tell.

Finally, we note that our analyses do not allow us to definitively judge whether or not families respond to the services and amenities of neighborhoods, like their parks or schools, or to the race or ethnicity of their neighbors. White families may seek to avoid schools that they perceive to be of low quality that are located in integrated neighborhoods, as the "racial proxy" or "race-associated reasons" perspectives suggest. Or, it could be that white families want to prevent their children from interacting with children of other races and ethnicities, according to the "racial reasons" perspective. Minority families with children may seek neighborhoods with more whites to gain access to better services like schools, to expose their children to white social and peer networks, and/or to avoid the perceived social problems of high minority neighborhoods. Future analyses with other kinds of data should focus on the reasons why children influence households' residential decisions.

References

Bobo, Lawrence; Zubrinsky, Camille. Attitudes on Residential Integration: Perceived Status Differences, Mere In-Group Preference, or Racial Prejudice? Social Forces. 1996; 74(3):883–909.

Charles, Camille Zubrinsky. Can We Live Together?. In: de Souza Briggs, Xavier, editor. The Geography of Opportunity. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institute Press; 2005.

Charles, Camille Zubrinsky. Neighborhood racial-composition preferences: evidence from a multiethnic metropolis. Social Problems. 2000; 47(3):370–407.

Clark, William AV. Race, Class, and Place. Urban Affairs Review. 2007; 42(3):295–314.

Ellen, Ingrid Gould. How Integrated Did We Become During the 1990s?. In: Goering, John, editor. Fragile Rights within Cities: Government, Housing, and Fairness. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield; 2007.

Fischer, Claude S.; Stockmayer, Gretchen; Stiles, Jon; Hout, Michael. Geographic Levels and Social Dimensions of Metropolitan Segregation. Demography. 2004; 41:37–60. [PubMed: 15074124]

Harris, David. Population Studies Center Research Report 97–386. University of Michigan; 1997. The Flight of Whites: A Multilevel Analysis of Why Whites Move.

Harris, David. 'Properties Values Drop When Blacks Move in Because…' Racial and Socioeconomic Determinants of Neighborhood Desirability. American Sociological Review. 1999; 64(3):461–479.

Harris, David. Why Are Whites and Blacks Averse to Black Neighbors? Social Science Research. 2001; 30:100–116.

Holme, Jennifer J. Buying Homes, Buying Schools: School Choice and the Social Construction of School Quality. Harvard Educational Review. 2002; 72(2):177–205.

Iceland, John. Where We Live Now: Immigration and Race in the United States. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press; 2009.

Iceland, John; Sharpe, Cicely; Steinmetz, Erika. Class Differences in African American Residential Patterns in U.S. Metropolitan Areas: 1990–2000. Social Science Research. 2005; 34(1):252–266.

Iceland, John; Wilkes, Rima. Does Socioeconomic Status Matter? Race, Class, and Residential Segregation. Social Problems. 2006; 52(2):248–73.

Iceland, John; Weinberg, Daniel H.; Steinmetz, Erika. US Census Bureau, Census Special Report, CENSR-3. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office; 2002. Racial and Ethnic Residential Segregation in the United States: 1980–2000.

Iceland, John; Nelson, Kyle Anne. Hispanic Segregation in Metropolitan America: Exploring the Multiple Forms of Spatial Assimilation. American Sociological Review. 2008; 73(5):741–765.

Iceland, John; Scopilliti, Melissa. Immigrant Residential Segregation in U.S. Metropolitan Areas, 1990–2000. Demography. 2008; 45(1):79–94. [PubMed: 18390292]

Johnson, Heather Beth. The American Dream and the Power of Wealth: Choosing Schools and Inheriting Inequality in the Land of Opportunity. New York: Routledge; 2006.

Krysan, Maria. Whites Who Say They'd Flee: Who are They and Why Would They Leave? Demography. 2002; 39(4):675–696. [PubMed: 12471849]

Landale, Nancy S.; Guest, Avery. Constraints, Satisfaction, and Residential Mobility: Speare's Model Reconsidered. Demography. 1985; 22:199–222. [PubMed: 3996689]

Logan, John R. Report by the Lewis Mumford Center, State University of New York at Albany. 2004 Apr 26. Resegregation in American Public Schools? Not in the 1990s.

Logan, John R.; Oakley, Deirdre; Smith, Polly; Stowell, Jacob; Stults, Brian. Report by the Lewis Mumford Center, State University of New York at Albany, May 4, 2001. 2001. Separating the Children. Updated December 28, 2001

Rosenbaum, Emily; Friedman, Samantha R. Differences in the Locational Attainment of Immigrant and Native-Born Households with Children in New York City. Demography. 2001; 38(3):337–348. [PubMed: 11523262]

Ross, Stephen L.; Turner, Margery Austin. Housing Discrimination in Metropolitan America: Explaining Changes between 1989 and 2000. Social Problems. 2005; 52(2):152–80.

Rossi, Peter H. Why Families Move: A Study in the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility. New York: The Free Press; 1955.

Speare, Alden, Jr; Goldstein, Sidney; Frey, William H. Residential Mobility, Migration, and Metropolitan Change. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company; 1975.

Squires, Gregory D.; Kurbin, Charis E. Privileged Places: Race, Residence, and the Structure of Opportunity. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc; 2006.

Table 1

Dissimilarity of non-Hispanic White Households by Household Structure and Poverty Status, 2000

			Reference Group									
Composition of the white household	Households with a Black householder		Households with a Black householder of the same composition		Households with a Hispanic householder		Households with a Hispanic householder of the same composition		Households with an Asian householder		Households with an Asian householder of the same composition	
	Number of metro areas	D Index	Number of metro areas	D Index	Number of metro areas	D Index	Number of metro areas	D Index	Number of metro areas	D Index	Number of metro areas	D Index
All households	121	0.600	37	0.634	121	0.435	46	0.476	106	0.438	13	0.445
All married-couple households with children	121	0.657	37	0.644	121	0.505	46	0.555	106	0.480	13	0.520
Poor	121	0.683	37	0.796	121	0.567	46	0.730	106	0.631	13	0.792
Not Poor	121	0.660	37	0.641	121	0.509	46	0.539	106	0.481	13	0.512
All single-parent households with children	121	0.591	37	0.680	121	0.437	46	0.549	106	0.488	13	0.622
Poor	121	0.606	37	0.730	121	0.486	46	0.637	106	0.587	13	0.802
Not Poor	121	0.607	37	0.673	121	0.451	46	0.554	106	0.484	13	0.644
All non-family households	121	0.566	37	0.607	121	0.411	46	0.420	106	0.427	13	0.446

Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3. Means are unweighted. Metropolitan areas with at least 1,000 members in the group of interest and reference group by table column are included in the calculations. The reference group for the family-level index calculations includes only family households (rather than all households).

Table 2

Interaction Index for non-Hispanic White Households by Household Structure and Poverty Status, 2000

	Reference Group											
	Households with a Black householder		Households with a Black householder of the same composition		Households with a Hispanic householder		Households with a Hispanic householder of the same composition		Households with an Asian householder		Households with an Asian householder of the same composition	
Composition of the white household	Number of metro areas	Pxy	Number of metro areas	Pxy	Number of metro areas	Pxy	Number of metro areas	Pxy	Number of metro areas	Pxy	Number of metro areas	Pxy
All households	121	0.068	37	0.105	121	0.057	46	0.108	106	0.025	13	0.072
All married-couple households with children	121	0.057	37	0.032	121	0.059	46	0.057	106	0.027	13	0.041
Poor	121	0.081	37	0.004	121	0.082	46	0.012	106	0.026	13	0.004
Not Poor	121	0.056	37	0.030	121	0.059	46	0.051	106	0.027	13	0.038
All single-parent households with children	121	0.079	37	0.045	121	0.076	46	0.033	106	0.027	13	0.007
Poor	121	0.099	37	0.025	121	0.092	46	0.017	106	0.026	13	0.002
Not Poor	121	0.073	37	0.027	121	0.073	46	0.020	106	0.028	13	0.006
All non-family households	121	0.081	37	0.041	121	0.063	46	0.028	106	0.027	13	0.023

Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3. Means are unweighted. Metropolitan areas with at least 1,000 members in the group of interest and reference group by table column are included in the calculations. The reference group for the family-level index calculations includes only family households (rather than all households).

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Table 3

Interaction Index for Black Households by Household Structure and Poverty Status, 2000

			Reference Group					
	Households with a non-Hispanic White householder		Households with a non-Hispanic White householder of the same composition		Households with an Asian householder		Households with an Asian householder of the same composition	
Composition of the black household	**Number of metro areas**	**Interaction**	**Number of metro areas**	**Interaction**	**Number of metro areas**	**Interaction**	**Number of metro areas**	**Interaction**
All households	39	0.358	37	0.358	36	0.023	8	0.049
All married-couple households with children	39	0.387	37	0.136	36	0.029	8	0.031
Poor	39	0.292	37	0.005	36	0.024	8	0.006
Not Poor	39	0.397	37	0.135	36	0.029	8	0.027
All single-parent households with children	39	0.288	37	0.039	36	0.024	8	0.008
Poor	39	0.245	37	0.010	36	0.021	8	0.003
Not Poor	39	0.315	37	0.032	36	0.026	8	0.005
All non-family households	39	0.358	37	0.161	36	0.025	8	0.017

Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3. Means are unweighted. Metropolitan areas with at least 1,000 members in the group of interest and reference group by table column are included in the calculations. The reference group for the family-level index calculations includes only family households (rather than all households).

Table 4

Interaction Index for Asian Households by Household Structure and Poverty Status, 2000

| | Reference Group | | | | | | | |
| | Households with a non-Hispanic White householder | | Households with a non-Hispanic White householder of the same composition | | All households with a black householder | | Households with a black householder of the same composition | |
Composition of the Asian household	Number of metro areas	Interaction	Number of metro areas	Interaction	Number of metro areas	Interaction	Number of metro areas	Interaction
All households	15	0.554	13	0.584	15	0.080	8	0.102
All married-couple households with children	15	0.510	13	0.204	15	0.076	8	0.029
Poor	15	0.384	13	0.006	15	0.114	8	0.005
Not Poor	15	0.525	13	0.207	15	0.072	8	0.026
All single-parent households with children	15	0.445	13	0.058	15	0.101	8	0.059
Poor	15	0.387	13	0.013	15	0.121	8	0.032
Not Poor	15	0.467	13	0.048	15	0.094	8	0.035
All non-family households	15	0.570	13	0.306	15	0.082	8	0.053

Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3. Means are unweighted. Metropolitan areas with at least 1,000 members in the group of interest and reference group by table column are included in the calculations. The reference group for the family-level index calculations includes only family households (rather than all households).

Table 5

Interaction Index for Hispanic Households by Household Structure and Poverty Status, 2000

| Composition of the Hispanic household | Households with a non-Hispanic White householder | | Reference Group | |
| | | | Households with a non-Hispanic White householder of the same composition | |
	Number of metro areas	Interaction	Number of metro areas	Interaction
All households	65	0.494	46	0.537
All married-couple households with children	65	0.444	46	0.169
Poor	65	0.356	46	0.007
Not Poor	65	0.461	46	0.170
All single-parent households with children	65	0.406	46	0.066
Poor	65	0.364	46	0.017
Not Poor	65	0.431	46	0.052
All non-family households	65	0.528	46	0.253

Source: Census 2000 Summary File 3. Means are unweighted. Metropolitan areas with at least 1,000 members in the group of interest and reference group by table column are included in the calculations. The reference group for the family-level index calculations includes only family households (rather than all households).